UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01621284 7

UNIV.OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/moderneuropefrom04dyeruoft

28C2
35

MODERN EUROPE.

MODERN EUROPE,

FROM THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE TO THE

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE,

A.D. 1453—1871.

BY THOMAS HENRY DYER, LL.D.

(*SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND CONTINUED.*)

IN FIVE VOLUMES.

VOL. IV. FROM 1714 TO 1796.

LONDON:
GEORGE BELL AND SONS,
YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.
1877.

[*All rights reserved.*]

D
208
D85
1877
V.4

484
24 | 3 | 90

CHISWICK PRESS: CHARLES WHITTINGHAM, TOOKS COURT,
CHANCERY LANE.

A

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF

THE FOURTH VOLUME.

CHAPTER XLII.

Review of the Epoch.—Age of Louis XIV.—State of Germany, Spain, and England.—The European System and Balance of Power.—International Law.—Colonization and Commerce.—Political Consequences of the Reformation.—Religious Consequences of the Reformation (pp. 1—38).

	Page
Results of the Peace of Westphalia	2
Age of Louis XIV.	4
The French Court	5
Social Manners	6
French Literature and Academies	7
Colbert	8
Consequences of the Reformation on Europe	9
Decline of the German Empire and increased Power of German Sovereigns	10
Character of Leopold I.	11
The Diets lose their Authority	—
Increased importance of France	—
State of Spain	12
Of England	13
Theory of the Balance of Power	14
Rivalry of France and Austria	—
The Peace of Westphalia restores the Equilibrium	—
Completion of the European System by the addition of the Northern Powers	15
Results of the League of Augsburg and Treaty of Vienna	16
Rivalry of France and England	—
Progress of International Law	17
Hugo Grotius	18
The Mercantile System	19
Colonial System	20
Spanish and Portuguese Colonization	—
Dutch Colonization	21
English Colonization	22
The Dutch in America	23
The English in America	24
The French in America	26
The Buccaneers	27
Effects of the Treaty of Utrecht on English Commerce	28
The French and English in the East Indies	29
Consequences of the Reformation on particular States	30
In Holland	—
In England and Prussia	31
Connection of Civil and Religious Liberty	—
Religious Sects	32
The Pietists	33
The Moravian Brethren	—
The Jansenists	34
Port Royal	35
Quesnel's *Moral Reflections*	36
The Bull *Unigenitus*	37
The Quietists and Fénelon	—
Rise of the Freethinkers	38

CHAPTER XLIII.

Spain Governed by Alberoni.—Philip, Duke of Orleans, Regent in France.—Venetian and Turkish War.—General Affairs of Europe till 1731 (pp. 39—61).

A.D.		Page
1714.	Philip V. and Alberoni	39
	Philip marries Elizabeth Farnese, of Parma	—
	The Princess des Ursins banished	40
1715.	Treaty with England	41
	The Duke of Orleans seizes the French Regency	—
	The Mississippi Company	42
	Foreign Policy of the Regent	—
	The Abbé Dubois	43
1716.	George I. allies himself with Holland and the Emperor	45
1717.	Triple Alliance	—
	Breach between Philip V. and the Emperor	46
	Retrospect of Turkish History	47
	The Morea wrested from the Venetians (1715)	48
	The Emperor aids Venice	—
1718.	Peace of Passarowitz	49
	Convention between France and England	—
	Quadruple Alliance	50
	Sardinia a Kingdom	—
	Conspiracy of Cellamare	51
1719.	France and England declare War against Spain	51
	Spanish Expedition to Scotland	—
	Alberoni dismissed	52
1720.	Philip V. accedes to the Quadruple Alliance	—
1721.	Treaty between France and Spain	53
1722.	French and Spanish Marriages	—
1723.	Death of Dubois and the Regent	54
1724.	Abdication of Philip V.	—
	He resumes the Sceptre	—
1725.	Louis XV. marries Mary Lescinska	55
	Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI.	56
	Alliance of Vienna	57
1726.	Alliance of Hanover	—
	War between Spain and England	58
1727.	Death of Catherine I.	—
1728.	Congress at Soissons	59
1729.	Treaty of Seville	60
1731.	Second Treaty of Vienna	—
	The "Family Convention"	61

CHAPTER XLIV.

Affairs of Poland.—Establishment of Augustus III.—War between France and the Empire.—Retrospect of Russian History.—Death of Peter the Great.—Catherine I., Peter II., and Ivanovna.—Revolution in Turkey.—Russian and Turkish War (pp. 62—81).

1733.	Death of Augustus II. of Poland	62
	His Son, Frederick Augustus, a Candidate for the Polish Throne	63
	Frederick II.'s Character of the Poles	64
	Double Election of Stanislaus and Frederick Augustus as King of Poland	65
	The latter proclaimed as Augustus III.	—
	The French abandon Stanislaus	66
1733.	Charles Emanuel III. in Sardinia	66
	Louis XV. declares War against the Emperor	67
	Alliance between France, Spain, and Sardinia	—
1734.	Campaign	68
1735.	Charles III. King of the Two Sicilies	69
	Campaign in N. Italy	—
1738.	Third Treaty of Vienna	70
	Lorraine acquired by France	—
	King Stanislaus, of Poland, abdicates (1736)	—

A.D. Page
1738. Augustus III. established . . 71
Retrospect of Russian History. 72
Peter attacks Persia . . . . —
His Death (1725) 73
Account of his son Alexis . . —
Reign of Catherine I. . . . 74
Peter II. Alexeiowitsch . . . 75
Death (1730) 76
Anna Ivanovna . . . . . —
Revolution in Turkey . . . 77
Achmet III. deposed (1730) . —

A.D. Page
1738. Russian and Turkish War (1735) 78
Austria joins Russia 79
Campaign . . . . . —
1739. Successes of Marshal Münnich 80
The Austrians defeated at Grozka . . . . . —
Peace between Austria and the Porte . . . . . —
Between Russia and the Porte. 81

CHAPTER XLV.

War between Spain and England.—Death of Charles VI. of Austria, and Accession of Maria Theresa.—Her Right disputed.—First Silesian War.—Retrospect of Swedish History.—Hats and Nightcaps.—War between Sweden and Russia (pp. 82—113).

1738. Disputes between Spain and England 82
1739. Convention of the Pardo . . 83
War declared between England and Spain. . . . . —
Admiral Vernon takes Porto Bello 84
1741. Fails at Cartbagena . . . . —
Anson circumnavigates the Globe . . . . . —
Death of Charles VI. (1740) . —
Accession of Maria Theresa . 85
Her Right disputed 86
Frederick II. of Prussia . . . —
Character of his father, Frederick William I. 87
The Prussian Army 88
Ambition of Frederick II. . . 89
His Proposals to Maria Theresa 91
Nature of his Claims . . . . —
He overruns Silesia 92
Battle of Mollwitz 93
Negotiations of Belle-Isle . . 94
Alliance of France and Prussia —
Treaty of Nymphenburg . . 96
Coalition against Maria Theresa 97
Alliance of Hanover 98
Anna, Russian Regent . . . —
Elizabeth Petrovna, Empress of Russia . . . . . —
The Elector of Bavaria invades the Austrian Dominions . . 99
Crowned at Prague . . . . —

1741. Forlorn Situation of Maria Theresa 100
Takes refuge in Hungary . . —
Convention of Klein Schnellendorf 101
Duplicity of Frederick II. . . 102
1742. Charles Albert of Bavaria elected Emperor 103
Frederick invades Moravia . . —
Battle of Czaslau 104
Peace between Austria and Prussia . . . . . —
The French driven from Bohemia 105
Campaign in Italy 106
Retrospect of Swedish History 107
Frederick I. and Ulrica Eleanora . . . . . —
Parties of the *Hats* and *Nightcaps* 108
1738. Murder of Sinclair, the Swedish Envoy, by the Russians . . 109
1741. The Swedes declare War against Russia 110
Revolution in Russia; Anna deposed in favour of Elizabeth 111
1742. English and Russian Alliance . 112
Project of a Scandinavian Union . . . . . —
Treaty of Abo between Russia and Sweden 113
1743. Adolphus Frederick elected to the Swedish Crown . . . —

CHAPTER XLVI.

War of the Austrian Succession continued.—Second Silesian War.—Francis I. elected Emperor.—Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle and Treaty of Madrid (pp. 114—139).

A.D.		Page
1743.	Death of Cardinal Fleury	114
	Enthusiasm in England for Maria Theresa	—
	Charles VII. flies to Augsburg	115
	Anglo-German Campaign	116
	Battle of Dettingen	117
	Charles VII. at Frankfort	—
	Alliance of Fontainebleau between France and Spain	118
1744.	Louis XV. aids the Pretender	119
	Italian Campaign (1743)	120
	Louis XV. declares War against England and Austria	—
	Campaign in Flanders and on the Rhine	121
	Frederick II. makes a Treaty with France	122
	Union of Frankfort	—
	Second Silesian War	123
	Italian Campaign	124
1745.	Quadruple Alliance	125
	Death of Charles VII.	—
	Peace between Bavaria and Austria	—
1745.	The Porte offers its Mediation	126
	Battle of Sorr	127
	Frederick II. at Dresden	128
	Peace between Austria and Prussia	—
	Francis I. elected Emperor	129
	Campaign in Flanders: Battle of Fontenoy	—
	Campaign in Italy	130
1746.	Campaign in Flanders and Italy	131
	Death of Philip V. of Spain	132
	Colonial War between France and England	133
1747.	Louis XV. attacks Holland	—
	State of that Country	134
	Campaign in the Netherlands and Italy	135
1748.	Negotiations and Conferences	136
	Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle	137
1750.	Treaty of Madrid	138
	Results of the War	—
	Conduct of Frederick II.	139

CHAPTER XLVII.

Colonial Quarrels of France and England.—Origin and Progress of the Seven Years' War.—Breach between Austria and England, and Alliance between Austria and France.—Armed Neutrality of the Baltic (pp. 140—169).

1754.	Colonial Quarrels of France and England	140
1755.	Naval Hostilities	141
	Origin of the Seven Years' War	142
	Projects of Kaunitz	143
	Breach between England and Austria	144
	Bad Faith of the European Courts	145
1756.	Treaty between England and Prussia	146
	Austrian and French Alliance	147
	The French seize Minorca	148
	League against Prussia	149
	Commencement of the Seven Years' War	150
1756.	Frederick II. invades Saxony	150
	Surrender of the Saxon Army	151
	Augustus III. retires to Poland	—
	Sweden joins the League against Prussia	153
	Persecution of the Jansenists in France	—
1757.	Louis XV. wounded by Damiens	154
	Treaty between France and Austria	155
	The French enter Germany	156
	Defeat of the Duke of Cumberland	—
	Convention of Kloster-Seven	157
	War in Bohemia: Battle of Prague	—

A.D. Page
1757. Battles of Prague and Kolin . 158
Gloomy Prospects of Frederick —
Saved by the lukewarmness of the Russians 159
Battles of Rossbach and Leuthen 160
George II. repudiates the Convention of Kloster-Seven 161
1758. Treaty between England and Prussia 162
Frederick's necessitous State . —
Ferdinand of Brunswick's Victories over the French . . 163
1758. Campaign 164
Battles of Zorndorf and Hochkirch 165
1759. Battles of Minden and Kunersdorf 167
Naval Hostilities between France and England 168
Armed Neutrality of the Baltic —
1760. Campaign 169
The Russians at Berlin . . . —

CHAPTER XLVIII.

Continuation of the Seven Years' War.—Revolution in Russia.—Accession of Catherine II.—Portuguese History.—Peace of Paris and Hubertsburg (pp. 170—188).

1759. Death of Ferdinand VI. of Spain 170
Wall, Spanish Minister . . . 171
Views of Pitt . . . . . —
State of Spain 172
Ferdinand IV. King of the Two Sicilies 173
Accession of Charles III. in Spain . . . . . —
1760. Death of George II. 174
Change of English Policy . . —
1761. Pitt's Negotiations with France 175
The *Family Compact* between France and Spain 176
Pitt rejects the French Ultimatum 177
Campaign in Germany . . . 178
1762. War declared between Spain and England 179
1762. Death of the Empress Elizabeth of Russia 180
Change of Policy of her Successor, Peter III. . . . . —
Peter deposed by his Consort, Catherine II. 181
Campaign . . . . . —
Retrospect of Portuguese History 182
Pombal's Reforms . . . . . —
Plot against Joseph I. . . . 183
France and Spain attempt to coerce Portugal 184
Negotiations for Peace . . . 185
1763. Peace of Paris 186
Peace of Hubertsburg . . . 187
End of the Seven Years' War . —
Results 188

CHAPTER XLIX.

Russian History.—Murder of Peter III. and Accession of Catherine II.—Anarchy in Poland.—Interference of Russia and Prussia.—Retrospect of Turkish History.—War between Russia and Turkey.—First Partition of Poland (pp. 189—217).

1762. View of Russian History . . 189
Character of Peter III. . . . —
Of Catherine II. 190
Deposition and murder of Peter 191
Accession and Government of Catherine II. 193
1764. Murder of Ivan VI. 194
1764. Death of Augustus III. of Poland (1763) 195
Anarchy in that Country . . —
Frederick II.'s Views with regard to it 196
Treaty with Russia 197
Stanislaus Poniatowski elected King of Poland . . . . . —

A D. Page

1764. Condition of Poland 198
Religious Parties 199
Interference of Catherine II. . 200
1767. Confederation of Radom . . 201
1768. Poland obtains a Russian Constitution 202
Rising of the Poles 203
Confederation of Bar . . . . —
Breach between Russia and Turkey 205
Retrospect of Turkish History —
Death of Mahmoud I. (1754) . —
Of Osman III. (1756) . . . —
Accession of Mustapha III. . —
Russian and Turkish War . . 206
1770. Romanzoff overthrows the Turks on the Kaghul . . . —
Catherine projects the Conquest of Greece 207
The Turkish Fleet burnt at Chesmeh 208

A.D. Page

1770. Contemplated Partition of Poland 208
The Austrians and Prussians enter that Country . . . 209
1771. Agreement with Russia for a Partition 210
1772. Convention of St. Petersburg for that purpose 211
Treaties of Partition 212
Declarations of the Three Powers 213
1773. New Polish Constitution. . . 214
Reflections 215
Conclusion of the Russian and Turkish War 216
Death of Mustapha III. and Accession of Abdul Hamed —
Peace of Kutschuk Kainardji . 217
Russian Pretenders . . . . —

CHAPTER L.

War of the Bavarian Succession.—Death of Maria Theresa, and Accession of Joseph II.—Disputes with the Dutch.—Revolutions in the Netherlands.—Death of Frederick II.—War between Russia and Turkey joined by Austria.—Scandinavian History.—Accession of Leopold II.—Peace of Sistova and Jassy (pp. 218—254).

1765. Death of the Emperor Francis I. and Accession of Joseph II. . 218
Maria Theresa continues to reign in Austria . . . . —
Question of the Bavarian Succession 219
1778. Preparations for War . . . 220
1779. Campaign . . . . . —
Peace of Teschen 221
1780. Death of Maria Theresa . . —
Reforms of Joseph II. . . . 222
1782. Pope Pius VI. at Vienna . . —
1781. Joseph razes the Barrier Fortresses 225
1784. Disputes with the Dutch . . —
Intervention of Louis XVI. . —
1785. Treaty of Fontainebleau . . —
Dissensions in Holland . . . 226
1786. Death of Frederick II. . . . 227
Character of his Reign . . . —
Accession of Frederick Wm. II. of Prussia 228
1787. He restores the Stadholder William V. . . . . —
1788. Alliance between England and Holland 229
Triple Alliance 230
Disturbances in the Austrian Netherlands . . . . . —

1788. Friendship of Joseph II. and Catherine II. 231
Prince Potemkin 232
1783. Disputes renewed between Russia and Turkey . . . . —
The Russians enter the Crimea 233
1787. Catherine II. founds Cherson . —
The Porte declares War against Russia 234
1788. Campaign 235
Review of Scandinavian History . . . . . —
Policy of Gustavus III. of Sweden 236
He overthrows the Oligarchy . —
Renews the Alliance with the Porte 238
Attacks Russia . . . . . —
Retrospect of Danish History. 239
Death of Frederick V. (1766) . —
Accession of Christian VII. . —
He marries Caroline Matilda of England . . . . . —
Struensee and his Reforms . . —
Juliana, Queen Dowager, forms a Party 240
Cowardice of Struensee . . . 241
Guldberg organizes a Conspiracy against him . . . —

A.D.		Page
1788.	Execution of Struensee and Banishment of Queen Caroline (1772)	241
	Rule of Guldberg	242
	The Danes invade Sweden	—
	Gustavus III. becomes absolute	—
	Progress of the Russian and Swedish War	243
1790.	Peace of Werela	—
1794.	Treaty of Drottningholm	244
	Continuation of the Austro-Russian War with Turkey	—
	Death of Abdul Hamed, and Accession of Selim III. (1789)	—
	Allianee of Prussia and Turkey	—
1790.	Death of Joseph II.	245
1790.	Revolution in Belgium	246
	Belgian United Provinees	247
	Reign of Leopold in Tuseany	248
	He accedes to the Austrian Dominions	249
	Negotiations at Reichenbaeh	250
	Convention of Reichenbach	—
1791.	Peace of Sistova between Austria and the Porte	—
	Submission of Belgium	252
1792.	Death of Leopold II.	—
	Franeis II. Emperor	253
	Progress of the Russo-Turkish War	—
	Peace of Jassy	254

CHAPTER LI.

Reign of Louis XV. in France.—Fall of the Jesuits.—American Revolt.—France and Spain allied against Great Britain.—The Armed Neutrality.—War between England and Holland.—Peace of Versailles.—Discontents in France.—The Notables.—The Etats Généraux.—The National Assembly (pp. 255—296).

1763.	Decline of France	255
	Infamy of Louis XV.	256
	The Corsieans revolt from Genoa	—
1768.	Corsica sold to France	257
1771.	The Parliament of Maupeou	258
	French Parliaments abolished	259
	Fall of the Jesuits	—
	Superstition of John V. of Portugal	260
	Obtains the title of *Fidelissmus*	—
	Gabriel Malagrida	261
	Pombal expels the Jesuits (1759)	262
	Proceedings against them in France	263
	Banished from Spain	264
	Universal Persecution of the Society	265
1773.	It is suppressed by Pope Clement XIV.	267
1774.	Death of Clement	—
	Wretched State of France	—
	Peculations of Louis XV	268
	His Death	269
	Accession of Louis XVI.	—
	He re-establishes the Parliaments	—
	The American Revolt	270
	Washington Commander-in-chief	271
1776.	Declaration of Independence	272
	The Americans aided by France	273
1778.	Capitulation of Saratoga	274
	War between England and France	275
	Battle of Ushant	—
	Hostilities in the Colonies	276
1779.	Spain declares War against Great Britain	—
	The combined French and Spanish Fleets in the Channel	277
	Naval and Colonial Warfare	278
1780.	The Armed Neutrality	280
	Russian Declaration	281
	Causes of the Armed Neutrality	282
	Rupture between England and Holland	283
1781.	Naval War	284
	War in America	—
1782.	Siege of Gibraltar	285
	Peace between England and America	287
1783.	Peace of Versailles	288
	Character of Marie Antoinette	289
	Affair of the Diamond Necklace	—
	Financial State of France	290
1787.	Assembly of Notables	292
	Parliament of Paris banished	293
1788.	Plan to supersede the Parliaments	294
1789.	Meeting of the Etats Généraux	295
	They declare themselves a National Assembly	296

CHAPTER LII.

A View of the Causes, Character, and Effects of the French Revolution (pp. 297—339).

	Page
Character of the French Revolution	297
The French Nobles	298
Policy of Richelieu	299
Feudal Privileges	300
Condition of the Peasantry	301
——— of the Burgesses	302
——— of the Church	303
Despotism of the Crown	—
State of the Provinces	304
Pays d'Election and *Pays d'Etat*	305
Inequality of Taxation	306
Centralization	307
Physiocrats	308
Economists	—
The New Philosophy	309
Infidelity	310
French Writers who influenced the Revolution	311
Montesquieu	—
Voltaire	312
His English Studies	313
Profligacy of the Clergy	314
Character of Voltaire's Works	315
The Encyclopædists	317
J. J. Rousseau	318
His Views of Society	319
Question of his Sincerity	320
Doctrine of Sovereignty of the People	321
Rousseau's Idea of Civil Freedom	322
His Notion of Equality	323
An Advocate of Aristocracy	—
His influence on the Revolution	324
Difference between Sensibility and Goodness	325
Effects of the Censorship examined	326
Degradation of the Monarchy	327
Effect of the American Revolution	328
Of the Deficit	329
Importance of the doubling of the *Tiers Etat*	330
Necker's Conduct examined	331
Mistakes of the Court	332
Effects of Centralization	333
Sovereignty of the Paris Mob	334
Character of the Deputies	335
Literary Influences	—
Affectation of Ancient Manners	336
Extenuating Circumstances	—
A Comparison of the French and English Revolutions	337
Different Character of Charles I. and Louis XVI.	338
Effects of the French Revolution	339

CHAPTER LIII.

Progress of the Revolution from the Royal Session in 1789 *till the Flight to Varennes in* 1791 (pp. 340—375).

A.D.		Page
1789.	Proceedings of the National Assembly	340
	Royal Session	—
	Oath in the Tennis Court	341
	The King annuls the Proceedings of the Assembly	—
	Union of the Three Orders	342
	State of the Army	343
	State of Paris	344
	The National Guard instituted	345
	Insurrection	—
	Capture of the Bastille	346
	Louis visits Paris	347
	The Emigration begins	348
	Massacres at the *Lanterne* and other Places	349
	Return of Necker	350
1789.	The Constituent Assembly	350
	The Duke of Orleans	351
	Robespierre	—
	Count de Mirabeau	352
	Debates of the Assembly	353
	Renunciation of Privileges	—
	Question of the *Veto*	354
	Plot to seize the King	355
	Banquet at Versailles	356
	The Mob at Versailles	357
	Storming of the Palace	358
	The Royal Family brought to Paris	359
	The Jacobin Club	361
	The Journals	362
	Marat	363
	Patriotic Contributions	364

A.D. Page
1789. Abolition of Tithes 364
1790. Origin of *Assignats* 365
Confiscation of Church Property . . . . . —
Sections of Paris 366
Mirabeau sells himself to the Court 367
Federative Fête—Embassy of the Human Race 368
Retirement of Necker . . . —
Civil Constitution of the Clergy 369
1791. Death of Mirabeau 370
Hopes of Foreign Intervention 371
Conference at Mantua . . . 372
Louis compelled to approve the Revolution . . . . . —
Flight of the Royal Family to Varennes. 373
The King suspended 374
Letter of De Bouillé to the Assembly 375

CHAPTER LIV.

Progress of the Revolution from the Flight to Varennes till the Insurrection of August 10th (pp. 376—403).

1791. Appearance of a Republican Party 376
The *Cordeliers* and *Feuillants*. —
Jacobin Petition 377
Remonstrances of Foreign Powers 378
Zeal of Frederick William II. and Gustavus III. . . . . —
Declaration of Pilnitz . . . 379
Act of the Constitution . . . 380
Close of the Constituent Assembly. . . . . —
Annexation of Avignon . . . 381
Self-denying Ordinance . . . —
Louis accepts the Constitution. 382
The Legislative Assembly . . —
Decrees against the Emigrants 383
The French prepare for War . 384
1792. Dumouriez Foreign Minister . 385
Roland and his Wife 386
Views of Prussia and the German Sovereigns. . . . . —
Louis declares War against Francis I.. 387
1792. First Hostilities : Flight of the French 388
Indiscreet Letter of Lafayette. 389
Struggle between the Girondists and Jacobins . . . . —
Insurrection of June 20th . . 390
Louis treats with the Coalition 392
The Marseillese 393
Fête of the Federation . . . —
Advance of the Allies . . . 394
Insurrectionary Preparations . 395
Threatening Address to the King 396
Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick 397
The King's Abdication demanded 398
Preparations to defend the Tuileries 399
Insurrection of August 10th . —
Murder of Mandat 400
The King takes Refuge in the Assembly 401
Capture of the Tuileries . . 403

CHAPTER LV.

Progress of the Revolution from the Insurrection of August 10th to the Execution of Louis XVI., and Declaration of War against England (pp. 404—432).

1792. The Girondists in Power : Danton 404
The Municipality . . . . . —
The Royal Family at the Temple 405
Extraordinary Criminal Tribunal 406
Proceedings of the *Commune* . —
1792. Domiciliary Visits 407
Massacres of September. . . 408
Question of Premeditation . . 410
Principal Instigators 411
Campaign on the Frontiers. . 412
Battle of Valmy . . . . . —
The National Convention . . 414
Royalty abolished. 415

A.D.		Page
1792.	Marat in the Assembly	416
	Battle of Jemappes	418
	The French overrun Belgium	—
	Royal Life in the Temple	419
	Louis XVI. arraigned before the Convention	420
	Appeal to the People rejected	421
1793.	The King condemned	422
	Executed	423
	Opinion of Europe	424
	Complaints of England	425
1793.	Insolence of the Convention	426
	Revolutionary Clubs in England	427
	England prepares for War	428
	Conduct of the Government examined	429
	The Convention declares War	430
	Treaties concluded by England	431
	Charles IV. of Spain and his Minister Godoy	432

CHAPTER LVI.

Progress of the Revolution from the Execution of Louis XVI. till the Execution of Robespierre, July 28th, 1794 (pp. 433—484).

1793.	Anarchy in France	433
	Insurrection in La Vendée	—
	The Revolutionary Tribunal	434
	Campaign of Dumouriez	435
	He threatens the Convention	436
	Arrests the Jacobin Commissaries	—
	Compelled to fly	437
	Committees of Public Welfare and General Safety	—
	The Gironde and the Mountain	438
	Trial of Marat	439
	Banquet at Sceaux	440
	Commission of Twelve	—
	State of the Provinces	441
	The Central Club	442
	The Convention overawed	443
	Arrest of the Girondists	444
	Marat assassinated	446
	Blasphemous Honours paid to him	—
	Constitution of *An* I.	447
	Campaign on the Frontier	448
	Committee of Public Welfare	449
	Proceedings of the Committee	450
	Fête of the Constitution	451
	The Criminal Tribunal reformed	452
	The Reign of Terror inaugurated	453
	The *Loi des Suspects*	454
	Marie Antoinette arraigned	—
	Executed	455
	The Girondists guillotined	—
	Duke of Orleans executed	456
	Republican Calendar	457
1793.	Worship of Reason	458
	Opposed by Robespierre	459
	Insurrection in La Vendée	460
	Admiral Hood at Toulon	461
	Reduction of Lyon	—
	Of Toulon	462
	Atrocities at Bordeaux, Marseilles, &c.	—
	Carrier at Nantes	463
	Siege of Dunkirk	464
	Battle of Wattignies	465
	Disputes between Austria and Prussia	466
	St. Just at Strasburg	467
	Campaign in Spain and Italy	—
	French Republic and Factions	468
	Robespierre and Camille Desmoulins	469
1794.	The Hébertistes exterminated	470
	Execution of Danton and others	471
	Robespierre's Fête of the Supreme Being	473
	Law of 22nd *Prairial*	474
	Robespierre absents himself from the Committee	475
	The *Chemises Rouges*	476
	Plot against Robespierre	477
	Catherine Théot	—
	The 9th *Thermidor*	478
	Robespierre and others arrested	480
	Scene at the *Hôtel de Ville*	—
	Capture of Robespierre	481
	Execution and Character	482
	Close of the Reign of Terror	483
	Its Character	484

CHAPTER LVII.

General Affairs of Europe.—Insurrection in Poland and Second and Third Partitions of that Country.—Death of Catherine II. of Russia and Accession of Peter III.—View of the Scandinavian Kingdoms.—Of Germany, Naples, the Papal States, and Venice (pp. 485—515).

A.D.		Page
1787.	Insurrection in Poland	484
1789.	Permanent Council abolished	486
1790.	Defensive Alliance with Prussia	487
1791.	New Polish Constitution	488
	Machinations of Catherine II.	489
1792.	Confederation of Targowitz	490
	Prussian Treachery	491
	Thaddeus Kosciuszko	492
1793.	Treaty between Russia and Prussia for the Partition of Poland	—
	Diet of Groduo	493
	Second Partition of Poland	494
1794.	Fresh Insurrection	495
	Kosciuszko Generalissimo	496
	National Council	—
	Warsaw besieged by Frederick William II.	497
	Prussian Tyranny in Poland	498
	Siege of Warsaw raised	—
	Kosciuszko defeated by the Russians at Maciewice	499
	Finis Poloniæ	—
	Third Partition of Poland	501
1795.	Stanislaus resigns the Crown	501
1796.	Death of Catherine II.	502
	Paul I. Petrowitsch	503
	Scene at the Tomb of Peter III.	—
	View of Scandinavia	504
	Administration of Frederick VI. as Prince Royal	—
	Zeal of Gustavus III. of Sweden against the French Revolution	505
	His Alliance with Catherine II. (1791).	—
	He is assassinated (1792)	506
	Accession of Gustavus IV.	—
	State of Germany	507
	The *Illuminati*	508
	Account of Baron Thugut	509
	Haugwitz and Hardenberg	510
	Naples under Ferdinand IV.	511
	His Minister Tanucci	512
	Pope Pius VI.	513
	Account of Venice	514
	Spain and Portugal	515

TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

(*The Years show the end of their Reigns.*)

THE EMPIRE.	FRANCE.	ENGLAND.	TURKEY.	SPAIN.
Charles VI. . . 1740	Louis XV. . . 1774	George I. . . 1727	Achmet III. . 1730	Philip V. . . . 1746
Charles VII. . 1745	Louis XVI. . . 1792	George II. . . 1760	Mahmoud I. . 1754	Ferdinand VI. . 1759
Francis I. . . 1765	(Republic.)	George III. . . 1820	Osman III. . . 1756	Charles III. . . 1788
Joseph II. . . 1790			Mustapha III. . 1773	Charles IV. . . 1808
Leopold II. . . 1792			Abdul Hamed . 1789	
Francis II. (Austria) . . 1804			Selim III. . . 1807	
	PRUSSIA.			
	FrederickWm. I. 1740			
	Frederick II. . 1786			
	Fredck. Wm. II. 1797			
POPES.	SWEDEN.	DENMARK.	RUSSIA.	PORTUGAL.
Clement XI. . 1721	Charles XII. . 1718	Frederick IV. . 1730	Peter the Great 1725	John V. . . . 1750
Innocent XIII. 1724	Ulrica Eleanora 1720	Christian VI. . 1746	Catherine I. . 1727	Joseph I. . . . 1777
Benedict XIII. . 1730	Frederick I. . 1751	Frederick V. . 1766	Peter II. . . . 1730	Maria Francisca 1816
Clement XII. . 1740	Ad. Frederick . 1771	Christian VII. . 1808	Anne 1740	
Benedict XIV. . 1758	Gustavus III. . 1792		Ivan V. . . . 1741	
Clement XIII. . 1769	Gustav. Ad. IV. 1809		Elizabeth . . 1762	
Clement XIV. . 1774			Peter III. . . —	
Pius VI. . . . 1800			Catherine II. . 1796	
			Paul I. . . . 1801	

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE.

CHAPTER XLII.

AT this epoch we pause a moment to cast a glance on some of the characteristics of the period extending from the Peace of Westphalia to the first French Revolution.

The wars which sprung out of the Reformation were closed by the Thirty Years' War—a crime too gigantic to be repeated. So long a strife, if it did not extinguish, at least mitigated religious animosity; above all, Rome saw that she had no longer the power to excite and nourish it. The results, both of the war and the peace, must have convinced the most sanguine Pope that no reasonable expectation could any longer be entertained of subjugating the Protestants by force. Nearly all Europe had been engaged in the struggle, and the cause of Rome had been vanquished. Nay, the Papal Court had been even foiled in the more congenial field of negotiation and diplomacy. The influence exercised by the Papal Nuncios at the Congress of Münster had been quite insignificant. A peace entirely adverse to the Pope's views had been concluded, against which, instead of those terrible anathemas which had once made Europe tremble, Innocent X. had contented himself with launching a feeble protest, which nobody, not even the Catholic Princes, regarded.

The Peace of Westphalia may, therefore, be considered as inaugurating a new era, whose character was essentially political. It is true that the religious element is not altogether eliminated in the intercourse of nations. The Catholic and the Protestant Powers have still, in some degree, different interests, and still more different views and sentiments; and in the great struggle, for instance, between Louis XIV. and William III., the former monarch may in some measure be regarded as the representative of the Papacy, the

latter of the Reformation. Yet in these contests political interests were altogether so predominant that what little of religion seems mixed up with them was only subservient to them, and a means rather than an end.

These changes were not without their effect on the intellectual condition of Europe. The same causes which produced the Reformation had set all the elements of thought in motion, had given rise to bold and original geniuses and great discoveries. The human mind seemed all at once to burst its shackles, and to march forth to new conquests. It was the age which showed the way. Columbus discovered a new hemisphere, Copernicus a new system of the universe, Bacon a new method of all sciences. Boldness and originality also characterized literature, and the age of the Reformation produced Shakspeare and Rabelais. The following period, of which we are here to treat, employed itself in working on the materials which the previous era had provided, and in setting them in order. It was the age of criticism and analysis. Intellectual efforts, if no longer so daring, were more correct. Science made less gigantic, but surer steps; literature, if less original, no longer offended by glaring blemishes at the side of inimitable beauties. The spirit of the age was best exhibited in France. French modes of thinking, French literature, French taste, French manners, became the standard of all Europe, and caused the period to be called the AGE OF LOUIS XIV. Its influence survived the reign of that Monarch, and gave a moral weight to France, even after her political preponderance had declined.

When we talk of the "Age of Pericles," the "Age of Augustus," the "Age of Louis XIV.", we naturally imply that the persons from whom those periods took their names exercised a considerable influence on the spirit by which they were characterized. In reality, however, this influence extended no further than to give a conventional tone and fashion. The intellectual condition which prevailed from about the middle of the seventeenth century till towards the close of the eighteenth was the natural result of the period which preceded it; and it might, perhaps, not be difficult to show that the same was the case with the two celebrated eras of Athens and Rome. It would be absurd to suppose that the patronage of the great can call works of genius into existence. Such patronage, however, especially where there is no great general public to whom the authors of works of art and literature may address themselves, is capable of giving such works their form and

colour—in short, of influencing the taste of their producers; and this is precisely what the Courts of Augustus and Louis XIV. effected. The literature and art of the Athenian Commonwealth were subject to somewhat different conditions. Greek literature was not so much the literature of books as the Roman, and still more the modern. The appeal was chiefly oral, and made more directly to the public, but a public that has not been found elsewhere—a body of judges of the most critical taste and discernment. Hence Attic literature and art present an unrivalled combination of excellences; all the vigour and fire of originality, subdued by the taste of a grand jury of critics. We mean not, however, to assert that the writers of the age of Augustus and Louis possessed no original genius, but only that it was kept more in check. It cannot be doubted, for instance, that Virgil and Horace, Racine and Molière, possessed great original powers, which, in another state of society, they might probably have displayed in a different, and, perhaps, more vigorous fashion, but at the sacrifice of that propriety and elegance which distinguish their writings.

If Louis XIV. claimed to represent the State in his own person, still more did he represent the Court, which set the fashion in dress and manners, as well as in literature. There was much, fortunately, in Louis's character that was really refined and elegant, and which left an unmistakeable impress on the nation. Although unrestrained in his earlier days by any notions of morality, he was far removed from coarseness and indecency. His manner towards women was marked by a noble and refined gallantry; towards men, by a dignified and courteous affability. He is said never to have passed a woman even of the lowest condition without raising his hat. There was no doubt a great deal of *acting* in all this; but it was good acting. He had made it his study to support the character of a great king with a becoming dignity and splendour, for he felt himself to be the centre of Europe as well as of France. His fine person was also of much service to him. Hence, as regards merely external manner, his Court has, perhaps, never been surpassed, and it is not surprising that it should have become a model to all Europe. It combined a dignified etiquette with graceful ease. Every one knew and acquiesced in his position, without being made to feel his inferiority. The King exacted that the higher classes should treat their inferiors with that polite consideration of which he himself gave the example. Thus the different ranks of society were brought nearer together without being confounded. The importance of the great nobility was reduced by

multiplying the number of dukes and peers; while civic ministers and magistrates were loaded with titles, and brought almost to a level in point of ceremonial with persons of the highest birth. At the same time certain honorary privileges were reserved for the latter which afforded some compensation to their self-love. They alone could dine in public with the King; they alone could wear the *cordon bleu* and the *justaucorps à brevet;* a sort of costume adopted by the King, which could be worn only by royal licence, and established a sort of equality among the wearers. All these regulations tended to produce a mutual affability between the different classes, which spread from the Court through the nation, and produced a universal politeness. Hence French society attained an unrivalled elegance of manner, which it retained down to the Revolution. There was nothing that could be compared to the Court of France and French society. Hence also the French language attained a grace and polish which render it so apt an instrument of polite conversation, and caused its general diffusion in Europe. The Courts of Austria and Spain were shackled by a cold and formal etiquette, destructive of all wit, taste, and fancy. The only Court which approached the French was that of England under Charles II. Essentially, perhaps, Charles was not more immoral than Louis; but he wanted that refinement which deprives immorality of its grossness. The result is manifest in the contemporary literature of the two nations, and especially the drama, the best test of the manners of a people. The English dramatists of that age, tragedians as well as comedians, with quite as much fire and genius as their French contemporaries, were grossly indecent.

In patronizing literature and art, Louis XIV. only followed the example given by Richelieu, with whom it was a part of policy. He knew that literature glorifies a country, and gives it a moral strength; that it makes the prince who patronizes it popular at home, respected and influential abroad. The benefits which Louis bestowed on literary men were not confined to those of his own country. Many foreign *literati* of distinction were attracted to France by honourable and lucrative posts; pensions, honorary rewards, flattering letters, were accorded to others. There were few countries in Europe without some writer who could sound the praises and proclaim the munificence of Louis XIV.

Even if it were compatible with the scope of this work, space would not allow us to enter into any critical examination of the great writers who adorned the reign of Louis. The dramas of

Racine and Molière, the poems of Boileau and La Fontaine, the sermons and other writings of Bossuet and Bourdaloue, besides the works of numerous other authors, are still in the hands of all persons of taste, not only in France, but also throughout Europe. For a like reason we pass over the great French writers who adorned the eighteenth century, many of whom will not suffer by a comparison with their immediate predecessors. A bare list of names—and our space would allow us to give but little more—would afford neither instruction nor amusement. During this period, however, arose that school of philosophical writers whose works contributed so much to produce the Revolution. To writings of this class, having a direct political bearing, it will be necessary to advert with considerable attention in a future chapter, when we come to consider the causes of that event.

If royal patronage can give a tone to works of imagination, it can still more directly assist the researches of learning and science. The King, in person, declared himself the protector of the *Académie Française*, the centre and representative of the national literature, and raised it, as it were, to an institution of the State, by permitting it to harangue him on occasions of solemnity, like the Parliament and other superior courts. In the state of society which then existed, this was no small addition to the dignity of letters. Under the care of Louis and Colbert arose two other learned institutions: the *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres*, and the *Académie des sciences*. The origin of the former was sufficiently frivolous. It was at first designed to furnish inscriptions for the public monuments, motives and legends for medals, subjects for artists, devices for fêtes and carousals, with descriptions destined to dazzle foreign nations with the pomp and splendour of French royalty. It was also to record the great actions achieved by the King;[1] in short, it was to be the humble handmaid of Louis's glory. But from such a beginning it became by degrees the centre of historical, philological, and archæological researches. The *Académie des sciences* was founded in 1666, after the example of the Royal Society of London. In the cultivation of science, England had, indeed, taken the lead of France, and could already point to many eminent names. The French Academy of Architecture was founded in 1671, and the Academy of Painting and Sculpture, originated by Mazarin in 1648, received a fresh development at the hands of Louis and his ministers.

If we turn from the Court to the Cabinet of Louis, we find him

[1] Martin, t. xiii. p. 161.

here also affecting the first part. But it was in reality by the ability of his ministers, Le Tellier, Colbert, Lionne, Louvois, that he found the means of sustaining the glories of his reign. After the death of Louvois, who, though a detestable politician, was an excellent military administrator, the affairs of Louis went rapidly to decay. Jean-Baptiste Colbert, one of the ablest ministers that France had ever seen, was born in 1619, the son of a trader of Rheims. After receiving the rudiments of a commercial education, he became successively a clerk to a merchant, a notary, and an attorney, and finally entered the service of the Government by becoming clerk to a treasurer of what were called the *parties casuelles*. Thus Colbert, though subsequently a warm patron of art and literature, had not received the slightest tincture of a classical education, and began at the age of fifty to study Latin, to which he applied himself while riding in his carriage. He owed his advancement to Le Tellier, who saw and appreciated his merit. In 1649 that minister caused him to be appointed a counsellor of state, and from this period his rise was rapid. He obtained the patronage of Mazarin, for whom, however, he felt but little esteem. The Cardinal on his death-bed is said to have recommended Colbert to the King; and, in 1661, after the fall of Fouquet, he obtained the management of the finances. The mind of Colbert, however, did not confine itself merely to his official department, but embraced the whole compass of the State. He had already conducted all the affairs of France during eight years, before he obtained, in 1669, the office of Secretary of State, with the management of the Admiralty, commerce, colonies, the King's household, Paris, the government of the Isle of France and Orleans, the affairs of the clergy, and other departments.

Colbert had taken Richelieu as his model, and like that statesman had formed the grandest plans for the benefit of France by promoting her agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and by developing the moral and intellectual as well as the material resources of the kingdom. He increased the revenue by making the officers of finance disgorge their unjust profits, by reforming the system of taxation, and reducing the expenses of collection. He improved the police and the administration of justice. He facilitated the internal communications of France by repairing the highways and making new ones, and by causing the canal of Languedoc to be dug, which connects the Mediterranean with the Atlantic. He also formed the scheme of the canal of Burgundy. He caused Marseilles and Dunkirk to be declared free ports, and

he encouraged the nobility to engage in commerce by providing that it should be no derogation to their rank. He formed the harbour of Rochefort, enlarged and improved that of Brest, and established large marine arsenals at Brest, Toulon, Havre, and Dunkirk; while, by the care which he bestowed upon the fleet, France was never more formidable at sea than at this period. His commercial system, however, though perhaps suited to the wants and temper of France in those days, would not meet the approbation of modern political economists. He adopted the protective system, and instead of encouraging private enterprise, established monopolies by forming the East and West India Companies, as well as those of the Levant and of the North. Colbert retained office till his death, in 1683. His end seems to have been hastened by the ingratitude of the King in appreciating his great services.

We will now take a brief view of some of the political consequences which attended the close of the era of the Reformation. It can scarcely be doubted that Germany, the chief scene of that event, viewed as a confederate State, was much enfeebled by it. Had the Empire remained united in its allegiance to Rome, or had it become, as it at one time promised, universally Protestant, France and Sweden would not have been able to play the part they did in the Thirty Years' War, and to aggrandize themselves at its expense. The bad political constitution of the Empire, which naturally contained within itself the seeds of perpetual discord, was rendered infinitely more feeble by the introduction of Protestantism. Having become permanently divided into two or three religious parties, with opposite views and interests, materials were provided for constant internal dissensions, as well as for the introduction of foreign influence and intrigues. The same was also the case in Poland. On the other hand, in those countries where the Reformation was entirely successful, as England and the Scandinavian Kingdoms, its tendency was to develop and increase the national power. It is true that the different German Princes, and especially the more important ones, grew individually stronger by the Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia. Such was the case even with the House of Habsburg, which, after the battle of Prague, in 1620, was enabled to render the Crown of Bohemia hereditary. The maintenance of a standing force of mercenaries, which obtained in most of the German States after the war, contributed to the same result, by enabling the Princes to usurp the rights of their subjects. The provisions of

the Capitulation extorted from the Emperor Leopold, in 1658, had the same tendency, by rendering the territorial Princes less dependent on the grants of their people;[1] and, as this Capitulation was wrung from Leopold through the influence of France, it must be regarded as a direct consequence of the Thirty Years' War. The enhancement of the power of the Electors of Bavaria and Brandenburg by this means, is particularly striking. In Bavaria, the States, which were seldom assembled, intrusted the administration of financial matters to a committee appointed for a long term of years; with which the Elector found the transaction of business much more easy and convenient. The power of the Prince made still greater progress in Brandenburg under Frederick William, the "Great Elector." After the year 1653 the States of the Mark were no longer assembled. Their grants were replaced by an excise and a tax on provisions, which the Elector had introduced in 1641, immediately after his accession; and, as these did away with the direct taxes levied monthly and yearly, they were popular with the householders, and there was no difficulty in making them perpetual. The conduct of Frederick William in Prussia was still more arbitrary. When the sovereignty of that Duchy was finally confirmed to him by the Peace of Oliva, he put an end, though not without a hard struggle, to the authority of the Prussian States, by abrogating their right of taxation; and he signalized this act of despotic authority by the perpetual imprisonment of Rhode, Burgomaster of Könisberg, and by the execution of Colonel Von Kalkstein, another assertor of the popular rights.

But it was in the direct ratio of the increase of strength in its separate States, that the strength of the Empire as a Confederation was diminished, because the interests of its various territorial Princes were not only separate from, but frequently hostile to, those of the general Confederation and of the Emperor. The minor States, which could not hope to make themselves important and respected alone, attained that end by combining together. Hence, the Catholic and Protestant Leagues, formed under French influence soon after the Peace of Westphalia, and under the pretext of maintaining its provisions. These Leagues became still more hostile to the Imperial power, when, soon after the election of Leopold, they were united in one under the title of the Rhenish League.

It must be confessed that the personal character of the Emperor

[1] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. iv. S. 324.

Leopold contributed not a little to produce this state of things. Leopold, who reigned during forty-seven years as the contemporary of Louis XIV., was in every respect the foil of the French Monarch. Hence much of the diversity in the political development of Germany and France. While the Imperial authority was being diluted by that of the German Electors and Princes, Louis was epitomizing the State into his own person. Under Leopold, the Diets, the chief bond of German Federation, lost all their importance. That of 1663, summoned on account of the Turkish War, he opened not in person; and he afterwards attended it only as a kind of visitor. He took no care to terminate its disputes on the important subject of the Capitulations of future Emperors, and permitted the Assembly to be interminable. Thus the authority and constitution of the Diet became completely changed. Henceforth neither Emperor nor Prince of the Empire appeared in it in person, and the Imperial Assembly shrank into a mere congress of ambassadors and deputies without plenipotentiary authority, who, before they could act, were obliged to apply to their principals for instructions. Business was reduced to a mere empty observance of forms and ceremonies, and a perpetual contest of the most trivial kind arose about degrees of rank and titles. Hence, from the Court and Diet, formality penetrated through all the ranks of the German people. Even in the promotion of science, literature, and art, which add so much to the grandeur of a nation by extending its moral influence, Leopold, though a more learned Prince than Louis, showed himself less judicious and efficient. Louis promoted the vernacular literature of France by every means in his power, and with such success that he rendered the French tongue the universal language of educated Europe. On the other hand, little or no Imperial patronage shone on German literature, because almost all the men of genius were Protestants. Leopold, who, being bred up to the Church, had received a scholastic education, amused himself by inditing Latin epigrams and epistles, and by conversing in that language with the learned; while, with his courtiers and family, and in the literary assemblies which he held in his apartments in the winter, the conversation was usually in Spanish or Italian. Hence German literature was still confined in the chains of scholastic bondage.

France, after the Peace of Westphalia, presents a picture the very reverse of this. The scattered elements of political power, instead of being divided and dissipated, were concentrated in a

narrow focus, and an intense nationality was developed. The progress of France, like that of Germany, had been arrested by the consequences of the Reformation, and by the long wars of religion under the Valois. It was Henry IV. who first restored tranquillity, and prepared France to take that place in Europe to which her resources and situation called her. But with the demands for liberty of conscience had been mixed up a republican spirit, to which even Henry's own example as the leader of a faction may have contributed; and this was further nourished by the immunities which he granted to the Hugonots. It was often difficult to distinguish between those who merely desired religious freedom and those who wished to overthrow the monarchy. Richelieu subdued this dangerous faction and founded the absolute integrity of the French monarchy. Having thus secured domestic unity and strength, he turned his attention to the affairs of Europe; and by his able, but unscrupulous policy, well seconded by Mazarin, France secured, at the Peace of Westphalia, the advantages already related, which were further extended by the Peace of the Pyrenees, in 1658.

Thus, when Louis XIV. assumed the reigns of government he had only to follow the course marked out for him. Without wishing to detract from the merit of that Prince, it may be safely affirmed that the state of Europe contributed very much to facilitate his political career. It was principally the weakness of Germany, resulting from the misfortunes of the Thirty Years' War, and that of the Spanish branch of the House of Austria, which created the strength of France, and helped her to become for a while the dictator of Europe. Spain, at the Peace of Westphalia, was still, indeed, to all appearance, a great Power. She possessed Naples, Sicily, and Milan, Franche-Comté, and Flanders, besides immense territories in both the Indies. Yet this vast Empire, from the necessity it entailed of defending remote provinces connected with it by no natural tie, was a source rather of weakness than of strength. France, entrenched within her own boundaries, and with scarce a single foreign possession, was a much more formidable Power. Spain was also internally weakened through bad government, fanaticism, and bigotry. The spirit of the two neighbouring countries was entirely opposite. While France was founding a new era of progress, Spain was falling back into the middle ages. In spite of the declining condition of the kingdom, the number and the wealth of ecclesiastics increased to such a degree that, in 1636, the Cortes of Madrid, in return

for a grant, obtained from Philip IV. a promise that for the next six years no more religious foundations should be established; yet even this limited promise appears not to have been fulfilled.[1] At the same time, while most of the principal towns of Spain had lost the greater part of their trade, with a corresponding decay in their population; while whole districts were in some instances reduced almost to desolation, and the kingdom to a state of universal bankruptcy, the Court of Spain, mindful rather of its ancient grandeur than of its present misfortunes, kept up a splendour and magnificence far above its means, and opened in this way another source of poverty. Add to all these evils the revolts of Catalonia and Portugal. The annexation of Portugal during a period of sixty years had tended to revive the declining power and glory of Spain; and now she was not only deprived of this support, but the long wars which she entered into for the recovery of that kingdom also became a source of weakness to herself and of strength to her enemies.

If the condition of Germany and Spain favoured the progress of France, that of England offered no obstruction. Cromwell, who assumed the reigns of power soon after the Peace of Westphalia, flung his sword into the French scale; and the two succeeding Stuarts, the pensioners of Louis, seldom ventured to dispute his behests. It was not till the accession of William III. that England again became a considerable Power in the European system. From this time was established a new balance of power, which may be best explained by throwing a hasty glance on the origin and progress of that system.

The first well-marked symptoms of that national jealousy which ultimately produced the theory of the balance of power, may be traced to the ambition of the House of Austria, and the suspicion that it was aiming at a universal monarchy. During the reign of Charles V., such a consummation seemed no improbable event. Master of Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, a great part of Italy, besides his possessions in the Indies, that Monarch seemed to encircle the earth with his power, and to threaten the liberties of all Europe. It was natural that France, whose dominions were surrounded by those of the Emperor, should first take alarm; and hence the struggle between Charles and Francis I. recorded in the preceding volumes. But France had to maintain the struggle almost alone. She sought, indeed, allies, and her treaties with the Porte show how the ideas of religion were already beginning

[1] Sempère, *Hist. des Cortés*, ch. xxxi.

to be superseded by political ones; indeed, the subsequent alliances between Catholics and Heretics were hardly so monstrous as this between Christians and Infidels. France also sought the aid of England, and sometimes obtained it; but from about as much regard for the balance of European power as was entertained by the Turks themselves. The policy of England, then directed by the counsels of Wolsey, had for its object, as we have before attempted to show, rather the national advantage, or even sometimes the personal aggrandizement of the great Cardinal, than the establishment of a balance of power. So far from this being the case, English policy was often adverse to such a balance, and, instead of supporting France, was thrown into the scale of her gigantic adversary. Henry VIII. himself was, perhaps, more influenced by a feeling of pride at the power he could display by intervening between two such powerful sovereigns, than by any regard to a political balance. Nay, it may well be doubted whether Francis was ever actuated by any abstract ideas of that kind, and whether he was not rather governed in his hostility to Charles sometimes by ambition and the love of military glory, sometimes by the requirements of self-defence, or the cravings of unsatisfied resentment.

Nevertheless, it is certain that the rivalry between France and Austria first gave rise to the idea of a balance of power. So great was the impression of alarm created by the exorbitant power of the House of Habsburg, that even the abdication of Charles V., and its severance into two branches, could not dissipate it. Half a century after that event, Henry IV., or his minister Sully, as we have before related, formed the scheme of opposing the *Theocratic Monarchy*, supposed to be the object of that House, by a *Christian Commonwealth*, in which all the nations of Europe should be united;[1] a design in which, however chimerical it may appear, we see the first formal announcement of the theory of the balance of power as a rule of European policy. After the death of Henry IV., French politics changed for a while, and a friendly feeling was even established with Spain; but on the accession of Richelieu to power, Henry's anti-Austrian policy, though not his extravagant scheme, was renewed, and was continued, as already related, by Mazarin.

We are thus brought down to the Thirty Years' War and Peace of Westphalia, which, as we have said, first in any degree practically established the European equilibrium. We mean not

[1] See Vol. iii. p. 63.

to affirm that such a result was actually contemplated either by the Princes who took part in the war, or by their plenipotentiaries who negotiated the peace. The former were actuated by various motives, and certainly not by any regard to the political balance; while the treaties afford no evidence that its future maintenance was the object of their ministers' care. Such, nevertheless, was the practical result of this great struggle. For although the attempt of the House of Austria, during the period of Catholic reaction, to extend its power along with that of the Roman Church, and thus to found a religious and political absolutism which would have been dangerous to all Europe, was chiefly opposed by France and Sweden, yet most of the European nations had been more or less directly engaged in the war; and we have seen that only three Powers, England, Russia, and Poland, were absolutely unrepresented in the Congresses which assembled to arrange the peace. At no preceding epoch, except, perhaps, during the Crusades, had the nations of Europe been so universally brought together. The Northern Powers now for the first time became of any importance in the European system. Sweden had played a part in the war more than equal to that of France, and had reaped corresponding advantages from the peace; and an intimate alliance was contracted between these two Powers which lasted a considerable period, and was of great importance in the affairs of Europe. Sweden became a leading Power in the North; and though she did not long retain that place, she only quitted it to make room for another Northern Power, that of Prussia, whose influence had likewise been founded by the events of the Thirty Years' War. Thus Northern Europe added another member to the European system, and another element to the balance of power. The discussion and adjustment of the differences which had arisen among these various nations in the Congresses of Münster and Osnabrück, and the rules then laid down for further observance, naturally drew them closer together, and cemented them more into one great commonwealth. It was now that the practice of guaranteeing treaties was introduced. Before the Peace of Westphalia it would be difficult to point to a treaty formed with a direct view to the balance of power; while after that event such treaties are frequent. Such were the Triple Alliance of 1668, the League of Augsburg in 1687, the Grand Alliance of 1701, and others. From the same cause also sprang that more intimate, as well as more extended diplomatic intercourse which now arose among the nations of Europe. Permanent legations

were generally established, and the forms and usages of diplomacy were brought to perfection. The French ministerial despatches of this period are among the best models of their kind.

The changes produced in the relative strength of nations through the Thirty Years' War and its consequences materially altered their European relations. Before that event the House of Austria had been the dominant Power. But the policy of Henry IV., of Richelieu, and Mazarin, against that House, had been so successfully pursued and consummated, that it was France herself which became in turn the object of jealousy and alarm. Louis XIV., before the close of his reign, was thought to aim at being the universal monarch ; and Europe, to save herself from his extravagant ambition, formed new leagues to regulate the political balance. It was not, however, till towards the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century that all the materials were provided for this purpose. Great Britain finally took her proper station as one of the arbiters of Europe only in the reign of William III. Nor was it till about the same period that the strength of Prussia and Russia began to be developed, and to complete the balance.

The League of Augsburg, formed in 1686 under the auspices of William III. (Vol. III., p. 419), may be regarded as inaugurating a system of European policy which lasted far into the present century ; of which, with some interruptions, the main-spring was the rivalry between France and England. The alliance between Great Britain and Austria in 1689 was purely political. There was no question of trade or commerce between the two countries, while their sentiments regarding civil and religious government were entirely opposite. Their sole object was to check the exorbitant pretensions of France, and preserve the political balance. On this foundation England continued to build. She generally threw her sword into the scale of Austria, though there is a period of remarkable exception. After the war of the Austrian Succession, Maria Theresa, as we shall have to relate in a subsequent chapter, deserted her most faithful ally, and formed a connection with France which lasted down to the time of the French Revolution. The declining state of France, however, at that period rendered this unnatural alliance less important than it might otherwise have proved.

The continental influence of Great Britain gradually increased. During the war of the Spanish Succession she began to employ the method of subsidizing foreign nations, whence the rise of her

national debt. Prussia and Russia, as we said, began to assume the rank of great European Powers, though their influence was not fully developed till the latter half of the eighteenth century, in the reigns of Frederick the Great and Catherine II. By their means the north and east of Europe were brought into closer connection with its southern and western nations. By this new state of things both France and Sweden began in turn to feel that opposition to their predominance which they had themselves carried on against the House of Austria. Both those countries, at the death of Louis XIV., had lost most of the power and prestige which they had derived from the Peace of Westphalia.

As the intercourse between the European States became, after that Peace, more frequent and intimate, so a more perfect system of international law grew up, and was, indeed, required for its regulation. This science had hitherto been very meagre and imperfect. There was no system of public law during the Middle Ages. When difficult cases arose, appeals were made, sometimes to the Pope, sometimes to the Jurists, and especially to the celebrated School of Bologna. Thus, for instance, the question between the Lombard cities and the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, at the famous Diet of Roncaglia, in 1158, was decided by the opinions of four doctors of Bologna, who appear to have been guided by the principles of the Roman law. It was natural, from the spirit of those ages, that the Pope should be made the arbiter of secular disputes, in which his authority supplied the place of a code of public law. For the same reason we are not surprised to find that the science had its origin among the monks and clergy, in those times almost the sole depositaries of learning, and especially among the casuists of Spain. The bigotry of that country and the proceedings of the Inquisition naturally attracted the attention of the learned to cases of conscience ; and it is an appeal to conscience which forms the basis of all international law. Hence Spain became unrivalled, as well in the number of her casuists as in their intellectual acuteness. The attention of these men was first directed towards the principles of international law by the discovery of America, which opened up so many questions respecting the conduct to be observed towards the natives. We find these principles first touched upon in the writings of Francis de Victoria, who began to teach at Valladolid in 1525, and in those of his pupil Dominico Soto. Soto, who was confessor to Charles V., dedicated his treatise on "Justice and Law" to Don Carlos. Soto was consulted by Charles V. when the conference

was held at Valladolid between Sepulveda, the advocate of the Spanish colonists, and Las Casas, the humane champion of the natives of the West India Islands, respecting the lawfulness of enslaving those unhappy people. The opinion of the monk, that no distinction should be drawn, as to natural rights, between Christian and Infidel, and that the law of nature is the same for all, is highly honourable to him, and shows him far in advance of his age. The Edict of Reform of 1543 was founded on Soto's decision in favour of the West Indians, and he denounced slavery altogether, in whatever shape.[1]

The science made some progress in the hands of Francis Suarez, a Jesuit of Granada, who flourished at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. One of the books of his "Tractatus de Legibus ac Deo Legislatore" is devoted to the law of nature and nations. It was Suarez who first perceived that the principles of international law do not only rest on the abstract principles of justice, but also on usages long observed in the intercourse of nations, or what has been called the consuetudinary law. His views on this point are even clearer than those of his contemporary, the Italian Alberico Gentili, though the latter has been by some considered as the founder of the science of public law. Gentili's father, one of the few Italians who embraced the Reformation, was forced to fly his country, and sent his son to England, where he ultimately obtained the Chair of Law at Oxford. Grotius acknowledges his obligations to Gentili's treatise "De Jure Belli," published in 1589, and dedicated to his patron the Earl of Essex. He had previously published (1583) a treatise "De Legationibus,"[2] dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney.

Balthazar Ayala, a Spanish writer who flourished about the same time, was not a casuist but a jurisconsult. He was Judge Advocate of the Spanish army in the Netherlands, under the Prince of Parma, to whom he addressed, in 1581, from the camp at Tournai, his treatise "De Jure et Officiis Bellicis." It is divided into three books; the first of which treats of war as viewed by the law of nations, with examples from Roman history and jurisprudence. The second book concerns military policy, and the third martial law. The ninth chapter treats of the rights of legation.

Several other authors had written on the subject of public law before the time of HUGO GROTIUS, who enumerates most of them at

[1] See on this subject, Mackintosh, *Dissertation on Ethical Philosophy*, sect. iii.; Wheaton, *Hist. of the Law of Nations*, p. 34.

[2] It was in this work, as we have before said, that Gentili defended Machiavelli's *Principe*, as a disguised satire upon princes.

the beginning of his work "De Jure Belli ac Pacis." Their treatises, however, were fragmentary, and the work of Grotius is the first in which the subject is systematically handled. Hence Grotius has been justly considered as the founder of the public law of Europe, and his book must be regarded as forming an epoch in the history of philosophy. We have already recorded Grotius's flight to Paris on account of the Arminian controversy, and the composition of his celebrated book in that capital,[1] where it was published in 1525. Thus, it was written during the first fury of the Thirty Years' War, and he announces, as his motive for composing it, the licence of wars waged without any adequate pretext. Grotius recognizes, as the foundation of public law, along with the law of nature, the right springing from custom and the tacit consent of nations. In this respect he differs from Puffendorf, who wrote about half a century later, and his followers Wolf, Vattel, and Burlamaqui, who found the law of nations entirely on the law of nature. Grotius supported his views of natural law by passages drawn from the writers of antiquity, and thus gave his work an appearance of pedantry for which he has been sometimes unjustly reproached, as if he wished to cite those writers as authorities without appeal, instead of mere witnesses to the general sentiments of mankind. Few authors have exerted a more extensive influence on opinion than Grotius. His work soon became a text-book in foreign universities, though its progress was slow in England. Gustavus Adolphus is said to have slept with a copy of it under his pillow.[2] It was not, however, till after the Peace of Westphalia that sufficient materials were collected to build up a complete system of international law. Leibnitz first made a collection of treaties to facilitate the study. Hence arose the technical school of publicists as opposed to the speculative, showing the last development of the science. Moser first founded that practical system of international law which rests on custom alone; in which school the works of George Frederick de Martens are the most celebrated.[3]

Among other characteristics of the period under consideration was the growth of what has been called the financial, or mercantile system. The production of wealth, the fostering of trade and commerce, became principal objects with most of the European Governments. But these subjects were still imperfectly understood. The chief aim was to obtain a favourable balance of trade,

[1] See Vol. iii. p. 113.

[2] Hallam has given an elaborate analysis of the *De Jure et Belli ac Pacis*, in his *Hist. of Literature*, vol. iii.

[3] On this subject see Garden, *Traité de Diplomatie*, t. i. p. 62 sq.

as it was called. With this view tariffs were framed and commercial treaties concluded. Recourse was had to restrictive, monopolizing, and prohibitory systems, which tended to produce isolation and even war. It was not before the latter half of the eighteenth century that philosophers began to promulgate more rational theories, or rather to revise some ancient Italian ones, and it was reserved for our own age to see them carried into practice. Commerce was now chiefly founded on colonization, which had reached a high pitch of development, and exercised a material influence on the prosperity and power of some of the leading States of Europe, enriching them both by the products of various climates and by the manufactures and other articles of native industry exported in return. Vast mercantile navies were thus created, the nurseries of hardy seamen; while the large fleets of war required for the protection of the colonies supplied a new element of national strength. Hence the colonial system has played so important a part in the wars and negotiations of the last two or three centuries, that we shall here give such a brief connected outline of its progress, down to the Peace of Paris in 1763, as our limits will permit.[1]

We have already taken a general view of maritime discovery and colonization down to the opening of the seventeenth century. The Spaniards and the Portuguese, as they were the first ocean navigators and discoverers, so they were the only nations which up to that period possessed any settlements out of Europe. The Spanish colonies were almost confined to the Western Hemisphere. They comprised, on the North American continent, New Spain or Mexico, with all the countries dependent on that viceroyalty; viz., California on the west, the vast and undefined region called New Mexico on the north, and on the east, Yucatan, Honduras, and all the countries on the isthmus which separates the two American continents. Some of these, however, and especially the northern and western districts, were but scantily settled, and subdued rather than occupied. In South America, Spain possessed Peru and its dependency, Chili, the kingdom of New Granada, the kingdom of Tierra Firme, stretching from the isthmus of Darien to

[1] On this subject see Robertson, *Hist. of America;* Raynal, *Hist. des établissemens des Européens dans les deux Indes;* the *Hist. générale des Voyages;* Lafitan, *Hist. des découvertes et conquêtes des Portugais dans le nouveau monde;* Lüder, *Gesch. des Holländischen Handels* (from Luzac's *Hollands Rykdom*); Du Tertre, *Hist. générale des Antilles habitées par les Français;* Heeren, *Handb. der Gesch. des Europ. Staatensystems und seiner Colonieen* (for a general view of Colonization and its European effects; in English, *Political System of Europe and its Colonies*); Bancroft, *Hist. of the United States of America;* Mill's *Hist. of British India*, &c.

the mouth of the Orinoco, and the southern colony of La Plata, or Paraguay. All these vast regions were subject to the Viceroy of Peru. Besides these continental possessions, Spain also held all the principal islands in the Caribbean Sea.

The maritime enterprises of the Portuguese, the rivals of the Spaniards in discovery and colonization, were chiefly directed towards the East. We have already indicated generally their settlements in Asia and Africa, as well as the foundation of the Empire of Brazil in South America.[1] By the conquest of Portugal by Philip II. in 1580, all the Portuguese colonies fell under the dominion of the Spanish Crown; so that at this period Spain was the sole possessor of all the European settlements in America and the East Indies. In the latter quarter the only Spanish possession, previously acquired, was the Philippine Isles, occupied in 1564. These were governed by a viceroy; but they were chiefly valued by the bigoted Court of Spain as the seat of Catholic missions, and most of the soil belonged to the monks. A regular commerce, carried on by a few South Sea galleons, had been established between Manilla and Acapulco, which diverted to the East much of the Mexican silver. The union of the Portuguese colonies in Asia under the Spanish sceptre, by exposing them to the attacks of the enemies of Spain, as well as by the neglect which they experienced from the Spanish Government, was one of the chief causes of their ruin. Nor had they been governed by the Portuguese in a way calculated to promote their strength and provide them with the means of resistance. The frequent change of viceroys, who were recalled every two or three years, prevented the establishment of a strong administration. King Sebastian rendered matters still worse by distributing the colonies under the three independent governments of Monomotapa, India, and Malacca, and by further lessening the authority of the viceroys by the addition of a council. To these sources of decay must be added a wretched system of administration, and the depressing influence which a bigoted and superstitious church naturally exercised upon all enterprise.

The shutting of the port of Lisbon against the Dutch in 1594, and the edict of Philip III. prohibiting his subjects from all commerce with that people, were followed by the most disastrous effects to the Portuguese colonies. The Dutch being thus deprived of their customary trade, and having discovered the weakness of the Spaniards at sea, resolved to extend their enterprises beyond the bounds of Europe, to which they had hitherto confined them, and

[1] See Vol. II. p. 137, sq.

to seek at the fountain-head the Indian trade, of which they had up to this time partaken only at second-hand through the medium of the Portuguese. We have already given a general sketch of the progress of the Dutch in the East Indies.[1] Batavia, founded in 1619, became the centre of their commerce and the seat of their government in the East. Trade, not colonization, was their aim. They at first avoided the Indian continent, where the Mogul dynasty was then very powerful, and sought in preference to establish themselves in the islands, with a view especially to the spice trade. Throughout the century their power continued to increase in Asia. In 1661 they wrested from the Portuguese Palicata on the coast of Coromandel, Calicut, Cochin and Cananor in Malabar, together with several places in Ceylon, Malacca, &c. The Portuguese were also expelled from Japan, and the Asiatic possessions of that nation were ultimately reduced to Goa and Diu. The extensive jurisdiction of the Dutch East India Company was divided into the five governments of Java, Amboyna, Ternate, Ceylon, and Macassar, besides several directories and commanderies; the whole under the central government of Batavia. Their colony at the Cape of Good Hope, founded in 1653, constituted a sixth government, and formed a sort of defensive outwork to their East Indian possessions.

The Dutch long enjoyed their pre-eminence in the East. The enterprises of the English and French, their only rivals in this quarter of the globe, were at first but slow and feeble. The attempts of the English East India Company, founded as we have said in the year 1600, to open a trade with the Spice Islands, excited the jealousy of the Dutch, and the most bloody engagements ensued between the two nations in the Indian Ocean and its islands. To put an end to these horrible scenes a treaty was concluded in 1619, between James I. and the States-General, by which the English were to be admitted to a share of the spice trade; but the Dutch, by their cruelties at Amboyna, to which we have already referred,[2] succeeded in excluding them from the Moluccas. In other respects, also, the English East India Company made little progress during the first half of the seventeenth century, and seemed on the point of dissolution. It had not attempted to make settlements and build forts, and had contented itself with establishing a few factories at Bantam and along the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel. It had, however, acquired Madras, by permission of the King of Golcondo (1640). The

[1] See Vol. III. p. 54. [2] Vol. III. p. 294.

Protector Cromwell somewhat revived the Company, by granting it new privileges (1658). Madras was now erected into a presidency. Charles II. also enlarged the Company's political privileges, and increased its territorial dominion by assigning to it Bombay (1668), which he had acquired as part of the portion of his consort Catharine of Portugal. Bombay rapidly increased in importance, and in 1685 the Government was transferred thither from Surat. The English power in the East now began to make more rapid strides. Before the end of the century, factories and forts had been established at Bencoolen in Sumatra and at Hooghly; and the district of Calcutta was purchased, and Fort William founded in 1699. During this period the French East India Company, established by Colbert, had planted a factory at Surat, in Malabar (1675), and founded Pondicherry on the coast of Coromandel (1679). Meanwhile, however, the Dutch continued to retain their monopoly of the spice trade, the French and English commerce chiefly consisting in manufactured articles and raw stuffs.

The Dutch had not confined their enterprises to the East Indies. They had also founded in North America, in the present State of New York, the colony of Nova Belgia, or New Netherlands. Hudson had explored the vast regions to the north, and the shores of the great bay which takes its name from him; and as Hudson was an Englishman, though he sailed in the Dutch service, this circumstance subsequently gave rise to conflicting claims between the two nations. The Dutch had also established a West India Company, chiefly with the design of conquering Brazil; and in 1630 they succeeded in making themselves masters of the coast of Pernambuco. John Maurice, Count of Nassau, who was sent thither in 1636, subdued all Pernambuco, as well as some neighbouring provinces; and by the truce between the States-General and Portugal, in June, 1641, after the latter country had thrown off the Spanish yoke, it was stipulated that the Dutch were to retain these conquests. In spite, however, of the peace between the mother countries, the war was renewed in Brazil in 1645; the Count of Nassau had been recalled, the Portuguese possessions were heroically defended by Don Juan de Vieira; and in January, 1654, the Dutch were totally expelled from South America. This was the chief, and, indeed, only important reverse which the Dutch experienced up to this period, who were now at the height of their commercial prosperity. Besides their settlements in the East Indies, they had extended their trade in the Baltic, and were become the chief carriers of Europe. They had also established

themselves at St. Eustatia, Curaçao, and one or two other small West India Islands. The first check to this prosperity was experienced from the rivalry of England, and especially from the celebrated Navigation Act, to which we have before adverted.

The English, indeed, under the sway of the pacific James, instead of opposing the Dutch in the East, had chiefly directed their attention to the Western Hemisphere, where their establishments made a surprising progress during the first part of the seventeenth century. In this period they occupied the Bermudas, Barbadoes, St. Kitt's, Nevis, the Bahamas, Montserrat, Antigua, and Surinam. In 1655, Jamaica fell into their power as it were by an accident. But more important than all these settlements was the vast progress made in the colonization of the North American Continent, to which a great impulse had been given by the voyage of Bartholomew Gosnold, in the last year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. By steering due west, instead of taking the usual southern route, Gosnold made the land at the promontory which he named Cape Cod, thus shortening the voyage by a third. The reports which he brought home of the inviting aspect of the country created a great sensation in England; and, as they were confirmed by other navigators who had been despatched purposely to ascertain their correctness, plans of colonization began to be formed. Richard Hakluyt, a Prebendary of Westminster, the publisher of the well-known Collection of Voyages, was a distinguished promoter of this enterprise. In 1606 King James I. divided the whole western coast of America, lying between the 34th and 45th degrees of north latitude, into two nearly equal portions; which retained the name of Virginia, bestowed on this part of the American continent in honour of Queen Elizabeth, in whose reign, as already mentioned, Raleigh had made an unsuccessful attempt to colonize it. The two divisions made by James were respectively called the First, or South, and the Second, or North Colony of Virginia; but the latter portion obtained, in 1614, the name of New England. The settlement of Southern Virginia was assigned to a London Company; that of the Northern portion to an association formed in the West of England, and called the Plymouth Company. James Town, in Virginia, founded by Captain Newport, in 1607, was the first English settlement in the New World. It was, however, Captain Smith who, by his courage and perseverance in defending the infant colony from the attacks of the native savages, and in cheering the settlers when dejected by famine and disease, may be

regarded as its true founder. After an existence of only two or three years, the colony was on the point of being abandoned, when the arrival of Lord Delaware with supplies, and the wise measures which he adopted as Governor, saved it from dissolution. Soon afterwards tobacco began to be cultivated, negro slaves were introduced, the colony gradually increased in numbers, and extended its settlements to the banks of the Rappahannock and the Potomac. Yet, in 1624, when the London Company was dissolved, scarce 2,000 persons survived out of 9,000 who had settled in Virginia. Charles I. granted the Colony a more liberal Constitution in 1639, after which it went on rapidly improving. At the beginning of the Civil War it contained 20,000 inhabitants, and by 1688 their numbers exceeded 60,000.

If the colonization of Virginia was a work of labour and difficulty, that of New England at first proceeded still more slowly. For many years the Plymouth Company effected little or nothing. The first permanent settlement was made in 1620 at New Plymouth, in the present State of Massachusets, not, however, under the auspices of the Company, but by some members of the sect of the Brownists, who had proceeded thither of their own accord. A charter was granted in 1627 to a company of adventurers, mostly Puritans, for planting Massachusets Bay, and by these Salem was founded. Emigrants now began to pour in, and in a few years arose the towns of Boston, Charles Town, Dorchester, and others. That spirit of fanaticism and intolerance which had led the Puritans to cross the Atlantic, accompanied them in their new abodes, and, by the disputes which it excited among themselves, was incidentally the means of extending colonization. Thus many of the inhabitants of Salem followed, in 1634, their banished pastor, Williams, and founded Providence and Rhode Island; while the secession of one of two rival ministers at Massachusets Bay led to the settlement of Connecticut (1636). New Hampshire and Maine were next established, but did not obtain a regular Constitution till after the accession of William III. Towards the period of the Civil Wars the tide of emigration to the New England colonies set in so strongly that masters of ships were prohibited from carrying passengers without an express permission. It is computed that by 1640 upwards of 21,000 persons had settled in those districts. In 1643 the four settlements of Massachusets, Plymouth, Connecticut, and Newhaven formed a Confederation, under the name of the United Colonies of New England. Maryland was settled in 1632, mostly by

Roman Catholics of good family, who proceeded thither under the conduct of Lord Baltimore.

In the latter half of the seventeenth century the English began to spread themselves beyond the boundaries of New England and Virginia. In 1663 Charles II. bestowed the land between the 31st and 36th degrees of north latitude on eight lords, who founded Carolina, afterwards divided (in 1729) into North and South Carolina. The colonization of this district had been previously attempted both by French and English settlers, but without success. Locke drew up a plan of government for Carolina, based on religious toleration, though its political principles were not so liberal. The rulers of the colony became tyrannical; and Granville, who, as the oldest proprietor, had become sole Governor in 1705, endeavoured to make the nonconforming settlers return to the Church of England. All the Governors, except Carteret, who retained his eighth share, were stripped of their prerogatives in 1728, when the government of the province was vested in the Crown. The State of Pennsylvania was settled by Penn, the Quaker, in 1682, the land being assigned to him by Charles II. for a debt. Thus all the religious sects of England had their representatives in the New World. Georgia, the last province founded by the mother country, had its origin in 1732. It consisted of territory separated from South Carolina. It was first settled, under the superintendence of General Oglethorpe, by prisoners for debt, liberated by a bequest, and aided by subscriptions and a Parliamentary grant. In 1735 it was increased by the arrival of some Scotch Highlanders, and of German Protestants from Salzburg and other parts: but it was ill-managed, and never attained the prosperity of the other settlements. The erection of this colony occasioned disputes with the Spaniards, who claimed it as part of Florida. The provinces of New York, New Jersey, and Delaware—which last was subsequently incorporated with Pennsylvania—arose out of the conquest of the Dutch settlement of Nova Belgia, in 1664, confirmed to England by the Treaty of Breda in 1667.

The French also began to turn their attention to colonization early in the seventeenth century, but their attempts were not in general so happy as those of other nations. Henry IV., indeed, laid claim to all the territory of America situated between the 40th and 52nd degrees of north latitude, under the title of New France, embracing Newfoundland, Acadia, Canada, &c., besides a great part of the subsequent English Colonies. The French first

settled in Acadia, in 1604, and the more important colony of Canada was founded in 1608. Its progress, however, was very slow. In 1626 it had only three wretched settlements, surrounded with palisades, the largest of which counted only fifty inhabitants. One of these was Quebec, the future capital. The continual attacks to which Canada was exposed, both from the English and the Iroquois, prevented it from attaining any importance till about the middle of the century. Montreal was founded in 1641, and in 1658 Quebec became the seat of a bishop. The colony felt the impulse given by Colbert to French enterprise. Troops were sent thither, the Iroquois were gradually subdued, and in 1687 Canada numbered 11,000 inhabitants. It was also under the auspices of Colbert that Louisiana was explored and claimed by the French Crown. Cavelier de la Salle, a native of Rouen, and celebrated navigator, having discovered the Mississippi, descended that river to its mouth in 1682, and claimed for France the tracts which it waters, as well as the rich countries on each side, lying on the Gulf of Mexico. These vast regions obtained the name of Louisiana, in honour of the French King.

The French also made some acquisitions in the West Indian Archipelago. They settled at St. Kitt's in 1625 (though in conjunction with the English) and at Martinique and Guadaloupe, ten years later. These islands, first occupied by private enterprise, were purchased by Colbert for the French Government in 1664, together with several others, as St. Lucie, Grenada, Marie Galante, St. Croix, Tortosa, &c., some of which had belonged to the Maltese. A subsequently much more important settlement than these was the French portion of St. Domingo, originally formed by the Buccaneers; a band of desperate pirates and adventurers, English[1] as well as French, who, about the year 1630, had established themselves at Tortuga, a small rocky island on the north coast of Hispaniola, for the purpose of preying upon the Spanish trade. Hence they began gradually to make settlements in the western part of Hispaniola, or St. Domingo. After 1664 these freebooters were recognized and supported by the French Government; the right of possession was not contested by Spain, and after the accession of a Bourbon Prince to the throne of that country, half St. Domingo remained in the hands of France.

The Dukes of Courland must also be ranked among the Ame-

[1] One of the most celebrated of these adventurers was Henry Morgan, a Welshman. After several years of perilous and romantic enterprise, Morgan retired to Jamaica with an enormous fortune, and was knighted by Charles II. See *Hist. of the Buccaneers*, pt. ii. and iii. Cf. Bryan Edwards, *Hist. of St. Domingo*.

rican colonizers. Duke James II., who possessed a considerable fleet, which he employed in discoveries and commerce, besides erecting several forts in Africa, encouraged his subjects to settle in the Island of Tobago. The flourishing condition to which they brought it roused the avidity of the Dutch. Two Dutchmen, the brothers Lambsten, by offering to hold Tobago as a fief under Louis XIV., obtained the encouragement of that King. The Duke of Courland claimed the protection of Charles II., to whose father he had been serviceable; and, by a treaty of November 28th, 1664, he abandoned to England the fort of St. Andrew, in Guinea, reserving only some commercial rights to his subjects, and agreed to hold Tobago as a fief under the English Crown.[1] The Dutch, however, would not surrender the island, which they called New Walcheren. It was taken in 1678 by Marshal d'Estrées, who, after reducing it to the condition of a desert, abandoned it. After this it was long regarded as neutral.

The colonies of the various European nations remained down to the Peace of Utrecht, in 1713, much in the same relative condition that we have described, though they increased, of course, in wealth and importance. The chief feature of the Spanish colonies was the progress made by the Jesuit missions in Paraguay. The Portuguese, more fortunate in Brazil than the East Indies, enlarged their possessions by founding San Sacramento on the Plata (1681); subsequently, however, the source of bitter disputes with Spain. They were also enriched by the discovery of gold mines near Villa Rica in 1696. The Dutch had added to their possessions in America Surinam, Essequibo, and Berbice.

The Treaty of Utrecht gave a great impulse to the English colonies and trade. The *Asiento*, or right of supplying the Spanish colonies with slaves, and the privilege of visiting the fair of Vera Cruz, proved very profitable, though rather by the opportunities which they afforded for contraband trade than by the direct advantages which they offered. Almost all the trade of Spanish South America now fell into the hands of the English. The South Sea Company, founded in 1711, began to flourish apace. The questions, however, which arose out of this traffic respecting the right of search occasioned a war with Spain, as we shall have to relate in another chapter. Spain had beheld with bitter, but helpless jealousy, the colonial progress of England. By the donation of Pope Alexander VI., even as modified by the Treaty of Tordesillas,[2] she conceived herself entitled to

[1] See Connor, *Hist. of Poland*, vol. ii. letter x. [2] See Vol. I. p. 322.

all the continent of North America, as well as the West India Islands. It was not till 1670, in the reign of the Spanish King Charles II., during which England and Spain were on a more friendly footing than at any other period, that the English possessions in America had been recognized.[1] After the accession of his grandson to the Spanish throne, Louis XIV. conceived the hope of checking the maritime and colonial power of England, which, from an early period of his reign, had been the object of his alarm and envy. The results of the war of the Spanish Succession were, however, as we have seen, favourable to English commerce and colonization. Besides the advantages already mentioned, conceded by Spain in the Peace of Utrecht, England obtained from France Hudson's Bay, Newfoundland (though with the reservation of the right of fishery), Acadia, now called Nova Scotia, and the undivided possession of St. Kitt's. Thus the sole possessions which remained to France in North America were Louisiana, Canada, and the island of Cape Breton. The places ceded to Great Britain were, however, at that time little better than deserts. The alliance between France and England, after the death of Louis XIV., was favourable to the progress of the French colonies. Their West India islands flourished, on the whole, perhaps better than the English, from the greater commercial freedom which they enjoyed, as well as from the custom of the French planters of residing on their properties. In North America the attempt of the French to connect Canada with Louisiana, by means of a line of forts, occasioned a bloody warfare, as we shall have to relate in another chapter.

In the East Indies no material alteration took place either in the French or English settlements till after the fall of the Mogul Empire. The French had taken possession, in 1690, of the Isle of France, and in 1720 of the Isle of Bourbon, both which places had been abandoned by the Dutch. After the death of Aurengzebe in 1707, the Mogul Empire began to decline, and the incursion of Nadir Shah in 1739 gave it a death-blow. The subordinate princes and governors, the Soubahs and Nabobs, now made themselves independent, and consequently became more exposed to the intrigues and attacks of Europeans. The most important of these princes were the Soubah of Deccan (the Nizam), on whom were dependent the Nabob of Arcot, or the Carnatic, the Nabobs of Bengal and Oude, and the Rajah of Benares.

[1] By the Treaty of Madrid, July 18th, ap. Ranke, *Pr. Gesch.* B. ii. S. 178.

It seemed at this period as if the French, under the conduct of Labourdonnaye and Dupleix, would have appropriated India; but the bad understanding between those commanders prevented the success which they might otherwise have achieved. Labourdonnaye captured Madras in 1746, which, however, was restored to the English by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. The conquests of Dupleix and Bussi were still more extensive and important. They obtained the *circars* or circles of Condavir, Mustapha-Nagar, Ellora, Radja-Mundri, and Tehicacobé, with Masulipatam as capital, together with large districts near Carical and Pondicherry, &c.; in a word, the French, about the middle of the eighteenth century, held at least a third of India. But the recall of Dupleix, who was succeeded by the unfortunate Lally, and the appearance of Lawrence and Clive, secured the preponderance of the English domination. Masulipatam was taken by the English in 1760, Pondicherry in 1761, when its fortifications were razed; and though Pondicherry was restored by the peace of 1763, it never recovered its former strength and importance. In like manner, the success of the English in the war which broke out in America in 1754, and especially the taking of Quebec by General Wolfe in 1759, compelled the French to abandon all their possessions on the American continent, except Louisiana, at the same peace.

No great alteration was experienced during this period by the colonies of other European nations. Though the English had taken Porto Bello and Havannah, they were restored to Spain at the Peace of Paris. Brazil, after the Peace of Utrecht, had increased in prosperity and wealth. The Dutch experienced no sensible diminution of their East India commerce before the Peace of Versailles in 1783. The colonial transactions of other nations are unimportant. The Danes, who had occupied the West India island of St. Thomas since 1671, purchased St. Croix from the French in 1733. In the East Indies they had obtained possession of Tranquebar. The Swedes also established an East India Company in 1731, but merely for trading purposes.

We will now turn our view for a moment on the inward and domestic life of the European States after the close of the great struggle for religious freedom. It does not appear that the Reformation was immediately favourable to civil liberty, except in the case of the Dutch Republic. The reasons for this it might not perhaps be difficult to discover. The principles of the Reformation had been introduced into Holland against the will of the Sovereign, and while the Dutch people had become universally

Protestant, their ruler was one of the most bigoted Papists in Europe. Hence persecution on the part of the Government, resistance on that of the subject, brought the question of civil obedience, as well as of religious submission, to an immediate issue. Liberty of conscience could not be enjoyed unless supported by political freedom; and, after a glorious struggle of eighty years, both were confirmed to the Dutch by the Peace of Westphalia. But in other countries where the principles of the Reformation had been generally adopted, they had been introduced at least with the connivance, if not with the direct support of the Government. Such was the case in England and in the Northern States of Europe. The immediate effect of this was to strengthen the power of the Monarch, by throwing into his hands a vast amount of ecclesiastical property and patronage. He no longer shared with a foreign potentate the allegiance of his subjects, and diverted into his own exchequer tributes which had formerly flowed to Rome. Hence chiefly it was that the Tudors became the most absolute monarchs that had ever swayed the English sceptre. It was also in a great measure from this cause that the Electorate of Brandenburg was developed into the powerful Kingdom of Prussia. In those countries also where the Reformation, though partially introduced, did not succeed in establishing itself, its effects, like the quelling of an ineffectual rebellion, were at first favourable to the power of the Sovereign. We have already adverted to this effect, in the case of some of the German Sovereignties; and the reader has seen how the religious wars of France enabled the King to reduce the power of the great nobles, and to concentrate the strength of the kingdom in his own hands; a work at length consummated by the policy of Richelieu. Hence, generally speaking, and with regard more especially to the European Continent, never was monarchial power displayed in greater fulness than in the period extending from the Peace of Westphalia to the first French Revolution. Most of the wars of that era, certainly all the larger and more devastating ones, were waged for dynastic interests and kingly glory.

It was impossible, however, that the impetus given to the human mind by the bursting of its religious bonds should be altogether arrested and destroyed. It could not be that the spirit of inquiry, when once awakened, and directed to all the branches of human knowledge, should not also embrace the dearest interests of man—the question of his well-being in society, of his right to civil liberty. This question, as we have

said, was first practically solved in Holland. Yet it was not a solution calculated to establish a theoretical precedent. The revolt of the Dutch can hardly be called a domestic revolution. It was an insurrection against a foreign Sovereign; nor was it in its essence an appeal to the people, as the only legitimate source of power.[1] To establish a Commonwealth, so far from being the object of the Dutch, was not even at first contemplated by them. They became republicans only because they could find no eligible master, and because it was the only method by which they could maintain their ancient rights. The true solution was first given in England. The absurd theories respecting kingly power, ostentatiously ventilated by a Sovereign with more pretensions, but less strength of character, than the Tudors, as well as his affectation of High Church principles, verging upon Romanism, incited the ultra, or Calvinistic, followers of the Reformation to a course of resistance which cost Charles I. his Crown and his life, and ultimately, through a long chain of consequences, resulted in establishing constitutional monarchy. It was these precedents, and the debates and discussions with which they were attended, the free utterances of the only truly national assembly in Europe, and the writings of men like Milton, Sidney, Locke, and others, which established not only for England, but all Europe, the true model of liberty combined with law and order. Thus the most striking instances and most influential examples of civil liberty in modern times were mainly the offspring of the Reformation; nor can it be doubted that the impulse of that great movement is still in operation, although its effects may not be so easily traceable.

It remains to view some religious phases of the period under consideration. In conformity with its general spirit, fanaticism itself seemed to assume a milder and more chronic form than in the exciting period of the Reformation. Instead of the Anabaptists and their atrocious absurdities, we find the Pietists and the Moravian Brethren. Even the Roman Catholic Church had its sects of a somewhat analogous kind.

The *Pietists* were founded by Philip Jacob Spener.[2] Born at Rappoltsweiler in Upper Alsace, in 1635, Spener became a preacher at Strasburg, and subsequently principal minister at Frankfort. Instead of the dogmatical subtleties which had been the chief themes of the Lutheran preachers, he endeavoured to

[1] See Vol. II. p. 430 sq.

[2] Mr. Carlyle, in his *Hist. of Friedrich II.*, vol. ii. p. 18, erroneously ascribes the foundation of the *Pietists* to August Herman Franke, instead of Spener. Franke, a much younger man, was one of Spener's followers.

introduce a more practical system of Christianity; and with this view he began, in 1670, to hold private prayer meetings, which he called *Collegia Pietatis*—whence the name of his followers. In these meetings, texts from the Bible were discussed in a conversational manner. His system, which is explained in his work entitled *Pia Desideria*, was intended to put the finishing hand to Luther's Reformation, which he considered as only half completed. Such a system naturally led to separatism, or dissent, which, however, he himself disclaimed. His sect may be regarded as a sort of German Methodists, or, as we might say, Low Church party. In 1686 John George III., Elector of Saxony, invited Spener to Dresden. The old Lutheran orthodoxy, by laying too much stress upon the saving power of faith, had caused many of its followers to neglect altogether the practice as well as the doctrine of good works. If they attended church punctually, communicated regularly, and discharged all the other outward observances of religion, they considered that they had done enough for their justification, and were not over strict about the morality of their conduct. The Elector himself may be included in this category, and some remonstrances of Spener's, which were considered too free, caused his dismissal from Dresden in 1691. Spener now went to Berlin, and in 1705 he died at Halle.

One of Spener's most celebrated followers was Count Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf, born at Dresden in 1700. The inclination which Zinzendorf displayed in early youth towards the sect of the Pietists, induced his friends to send him to Paris, with the view of diverting his mind from such thoughts. But his stay in that capital (1719-21) was precisely the period when the Jansenist controversy was at its height; the discussion of which subject, as well as his intercourse with Cardinal Noailles, only served to increase his religious enthusiasm. After his return to Dresden Zinzendorf began to hold *Collegia Pietatis* in imitation of Spener's. At these meetings he became acquainted with Christian David, a journeyman carpenter of Fulneck in Silesia. It was in the neighbourhood of Fulneck that the Bohemian Brethren, the last remnants of the Hussites, had contrived to maintain themselves, by ostensibly complying with the dominant Church, whilst in private they retained the religion of their forefathers.[1] Some inquisitions, made by the Imperial Government in 1720, having compelled the members of this sect to emigrate, Christian David proceeded to

[1] Menzel, B. iii. S. 481; B. iv. Kap. 39.

Dresden, where, as we have said, he became acquainted with Count Zinzendorf, and obtained permission to settle with some of his brethren on that nobleman's estate of Bertheldsdorf in the neighbourhood of Zittau in Lusatia. The first colony was planted on the Hutberg in 1722, and was called *Herrn-hut* (the Lord's care). The creed of the Moravian Brethren seems to have been an indiscriminate mixture of Lutheran and Calvinistic tenets with those of their own sect. Count Zinzendorf added to these some peculiar notions of his own; establishing as his main dogma the wounds and sacrifice of Christ; or, as he styled it, the Blood and Cross Theology. In 1737 he procured himself to be named bishop of this new sect. Frederick II. of Prussia, after his conquest of Silesia, protected the rising colony, and allowed it the open and independent exercise of its worship. The numbers of the *Herrnhuter*, or Moravian Brethren (so called from the first members being refugees from Moravia), soon wonderfully increased, and they spread themselves in most parts of the world. Count Zinzendorf died in 1760, at Herrnhut, which is still a flourishing little town.

Of the sects which sprung up in the Roman Catholic Church, the most celebrated was that of the Jansenists, so called from its founder, Cornelius Janssen, a Fleming. Educated at Louvain, which he quitted in 1617, Janssen ultimately became Bishop of Ypres. The distinguishing feature of his system was the adoption in their most rigid form of the tenets of St. Augustine respecting predestination and absolute decrees. In fact, Jansenius and his followers, except that they retained some of the sacraments of the Romish Church, and especially that of the Eucharist, approached more nearly the doctrines of Calvin than those of Rome. Jansenius explained his views in his book entitled *Augustinus*.

Jansenism was introduced into France by Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, the friend and fellow-collegian of Janssen. Duvergier, by birth a Basque, became abbot of the little monastery of St. Cyran, in Provence; an office which he refused to exchange for the episcopal mitre. In 1635 St. Cyran became the spiritual director of Mother Angelica (Angelica Arnaud), the Superior of Port Royal, the celebrated Parisian convent of Benedictine nuns.[1] Under the auspices of St. Cyran, Jansenism became the creed of the Society. Like other apostles, however, St. Cyran had to

[1] The original Port Royal was at Chévreuse, about eighteen miles west of Paris. In 1626 the community was transferred to the Rue de la Bourbe in the Faubourg St. Jacques of that capital; and subsequently it was divided into two establishments, Port Royal de Paris and Port Royal des Champs. For the history of this celebrated institution, see the works of Racine and Sainte Beuve.

endure persecution. Neither the political nor the religious tenets of the Jansenists were agreeable to Cardinal Richelieu. The Bishop of Ypres had violently opposed and denounced Richelieu's designs upon Lorraine and the Spanish Netherlands in a pamphlet entitled *Mars Gallicus*. St. Cyran himself, suspected on account of his connection with an enemy of France, had opposed the cassation of the marriage of the King's brother, Gaston d'Orleans, with Margaret of Lorraine.[1] His own freely expressed opinions and those of his disciples of Port Royal respecting kings were but ill suited to royal ears in those days. He had also offended Richelieu by haughtily repulsing all his advances and repeatedly refusing the offer of a bishopric. In May, 1638, a *lettre de cachet* transferred St. Cyran to the dungeon of Vincennes. Persecution, however, as usual, served only to attract attention and add a new interest to his life and opinions. Port Royal acquired more influence than ever. It was now that the distinguished recluses began to gather round it to whom it chiefly owes its fame. The first of these were kinsmen of the abbess—her nephew Antony Lemaistre, her brother Antony Arnaud, the author of the celebrated treatise *De la fréquente communion*. These *hermits*, as they were called, and their pupils, inhabited a separate building called *La maison des hommes*. It was Arnaud and his colleague Nicole who published those works on grammar, logic, and other branches of education which still preserve their reputation. The Jesuits found themselves worsted in their own peculiar domain as instructors. A still greater champion appeared rather later in the Society—Blaise Pascal,[2] the author of the *Pensées*, the redoubtable adversary of the Jesuits. Pascal, who had become a convert to Jansenism in 1646, entered Port Royal in 1654. His *Lettres Provinciales* (Letters to a Provincial) were a terrible blow to the Jesuits. It was after this period that they began to direct their attention more to worldly affairs and commerce, to their ultimate ruin.

The dangerous tendency of Jansenism had not escaped the vigilance of Rome and the more orthodox clergy. Jansenius's work *Augustinus*, was condemned by a bull of Pope Urban VIII. in 1643. In 1644, at the instigation of the Jesuits, eighty-five French bishops presented to Urban's successor, Innocent X., five propositions, extracted, as they said, from the *Augustinus*, for

[1] For these occurrences, see Vol. iii. p. 224 sqq.

[2] Born at Clermont in Auvergne in 1623. St. Cyran was released from Vincennes after the death of Richelieu.

condemnation as heretical. Only a small minority of prelates stood up in their defence, but it was not till 1653 that Innocent condemned them. The Papal bull was accepted by Anne of Austria and Mazarin, by the Bishops and the Sorbonne; Port Royal and the Jansenists seemed on the verge of destruction, when they were saved by the *Provincial Letters*.

In spite of the hostility of Louis XIV., repeatedly manifested, the Jansenists were destined to survive his reign, though Port Royal fell before its close. The imprudence and disputatious humour of the Jansenists brought their doctrines again into question in 1702. The King's antipathy to them was increased by some papers seized at Brussels in the house of their chief, Father Quesnel; from which it appeared that they had formerly purchased the Isle of Nordstrand, on the coast of Holstein, to form an asylum for their sect; and also that they had endeavoured to get themselves comprised in the truce of Ratisbon in 1684, under the name of the "Disciples of St. Augustine," as if they formed a political body like Lutherans or Calvinists. Louis, in his own name, and in that of Philip V., now besought Pope Clement XI. to renew against the Jansenists the constitutions of his predecessors. Clement complied by a bull, which was accepted by the French clergy, in spite of the opposition of Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris (1705). To revenge themselves on Noailles, the Jesuits obtained from Clement a condemnation of Quesnel's *Moral Reflections on the New Testament*; a book of much repute, which had been published under the superintendence of the Cardinal, and which Clement himself is said to have praised. A ruder stroke was the suppression of the Abbey of Port Royal. The nuns had refused to accept the Papal bull of 1705. Le Tellier, who had succeeded Père La Chaise as the King's confessor, resorted to violent measures, and the Cardinal de Noailles, to clear himself from the suspicion of being a Jansenist, gave his sanction to them. In November, 1709, the nuns of Port Royal were dragged from their abode and dispersed in various convents; and the famous abbey itself, consecrated by the memory of so much virtue, piety, and talent, was razed to its foundations.

Although the Cardinal de Noailles had taken part in the persecution of the Port Royalists, he refused to retract the approbation which he had given to Quesnel's book. Louis's Jesuit confessor, Le Tellier, instigated several bishops to denounce him to the King as an introducer of new doctrines; the book was prohibited by the

Royal Council; and Pope Clement XI. was requested to give it a fresh condemnation in a form which might be received in France. After waiting nearly two years, Clement replied by promulgating the famous Bull Unigenitus (September 8th, 1713). Instead of the general terms of the former bull, the present instrument expressly condemned 101 propositions extracted from the *Réflexions Morales*. Many of these breathe the spirit of true Christianity, and might be found in the writings of St. Augustine and even of St. Paul. Noailles and a few other prelates protested against the bull; but the King compelled the Parliament to register it, and the Sorbonne and other universities to receive it, the principal opponents of it being sent into exile. Nevertheless, the recusant bishops, who did not exceed fifteen in number, were supported by most of the principal religious orders, by the majority of the clergy, and by the opinion of the public, always adverse to the Jesuits. Le Tellier now endeavoured to obtain the deposition of Noailles from the Archbishopric of Paris; and he was saved from that degradation only by the death of Louis XIV. The disputes proceeded during the Regency. The Jansenists seemed to gather fresh strength, and talked of appealing against the bull to a future Council. To put an end to the contest, and to save the Parliament, threatened with dissolution by the Court for refusing to register a Royal Decree for the acceptance of the bull, Noailles at length agreed to subscribe to it, with certain modifications. The question, however, was by no means set at rest. It was again agitated in the pontificate of Benedict XIII., in 1725; and, in 1750, it produced a great public scandal and disturbance, as we shall have to relate in a subsequent chapter.

The *Quietists*, another Roman Catholic sect, was much less important than the Jansenists. Their mystical tenets—a sort of inward, quiet, contemplation of the Divine perfections, a worship of the heart—were too refined and transcendental to attract many followers. The founder of the sect in France was Madame Guyon, who gave her principles to the world in two works, entitled *Le Moyen Court* and *Les Torrents*. The talent and enthusiasm of Madame Guyon obtained for her an illustrious disciple in Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, the amiable and ingenious author of *Telemachus*. The sect had previously appeared in Italy, where the doctrines of Quietism had been propagated by a Spanish priest named Molinos. It had there been found, however—what is not unfrequently the case with exalted religious enthusiasm—that these mystical tenets had been productive of gross immorality among his

disciples, who imagined that, so long as the soul was wrapped up in God, the acts of the body were of little consequence; and, in 1687, Molinos had been condemned by the Inquisition at Rome to perpetual imprisonment. These circumstances at first threw a suspicion on the French Quietists, who, however, do not appear to have deserved the reproach of immorality. But their doctrines were approved neither by the orthodox clergy nor by the Jansenists. Bossuet, the illustrious Bishop of Meaux, was their most virulent opponent. He caused Madame Guyon to be imprisoned at Vincennes, entered into a violent controversy with Fénelon, and procured from Pope Innocent XII. a condemnation of that prelate's work, entitled *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie Intérieure*, in which he had explained and defended his principles. This affair, as well as the publication of *Telemachus*, entirely ruined Fénelon with Louis XIV. and Madame Maintenon, and deprived him of all his former influence.[1]

It is not our intention to describe the various religious sects which sprung up in England during this period, as the Independents, Quakers, Methodists, &c. As the Reformation had a tendency to produce sectarianism in men of enthusiastic temperaments, so, on the other hand, among those of cooler and more reasoning minds it was apt to beget scepticism and infidelity. The English School of Freethinkers took its rise in the seventeenth century with Hobbes, Shaftesbury, Tindal, Bolingbroke, and others; and hence was derived the French sceptical philosophy which produced the Revolution.

[1] See Bausset, *Vie de Fénelon*, t. ii. and iii. (ed. 1817).

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE Peace of Utrecht had reconciled all the contending Powers in the War of the Spanish Succession, except the two Sovereigns principally concerned in the dispute. The questions at issue between Philip V. and Charles VI. still remained to be settled by future wars and negotiations. In the military and diplomatic transactions which ensued, Spain, directed by the will of a youthful and ambitious Queen, and the counsels of a subtle and enterprising Minister, seemed inspired with new vigour, and promised again to take a first rank in the affairs of Europe.

After the death of Philip V.'s first wife, Louisa of Savoy (February, 1714), a woman of courage and understanding above her sex, the Princess des Ursins, had assumed for a while the government of the King and Kingdom. But the uxorious temper of the melancholy, devout, and moral Philip, demanded another consort; and the Princess, too old herself to fill that post, though rumour gave her credit for aspiring to it, resolved to procure for him a Queen of a docile and pliant disposition, who would not contest with her the empire which she exercised over the King. With this view she consulted Alberoni, who now enjoyed a considerable share of the royal confidence and favour. This extraordinary man, the son of a working gardener, and a native of Piacenza, had been by turns a bell-ringer, an *abbé*, the steward of a bishop, the favourite and confidant of the Duke of Vendôme, and lastly, the agent of the Duke of Parma at Madrid. Alberoni, as if by accident, and after running over a great many names, recommended Elizabeth Farnese, the niece of his Sovereign, the reigning Duke of Parma, as the future Queen of Spain. She was, he said, a good Lombard girl, brought up on the butter and cheese of the country, and accustomed to hear of nothing in the little Court in which she had been educated but embroidery and needlework. The consent of Louis XIV. was obtained to the union, and, on September 16th, 1714, not much more than half a year after the death of Philip's first wife, his nuptials with the Parmesan Princess were celebrated by proxy at Parma.

The Princess des Ursins learned, when it was too late, the real character of Elizabeth Farnese. She discovered that, instead of a simple, pliant girl, whom she might easily control, the new Queen possessed a penetrating mind and a resolute and lofty spirit. Alarmed by this intelligence, she had despatched a messenger to Parma to prevent the marriage from taking place; but he arrived on the very morning of the ceremony, and was not admitted to an audience till it had been concluded. The very first interview with the new Queen showed the Princess des Ursins how fatally she had been deceived. Having preceded Philip to a small village beyond Guadalaxara, in order to meet her new mistress in her capacity of *camerara-mayor*, she approached Elizabeth with all the confidence of a favourite, when, to her utter dismay, the Queen ordered her to be arrested, and, though the weather was cold, to be conveyed, as she was, in her court dress, to Burgos! Alberoni had procured the order for her arrest from Philip V., at the instance of the Duke of Parma, and with the consent of Louis XIV.

"A wife and a bassock," Alberoni was accustomed to remark, "are all that the King of Spain needs." From temperament, it was a necessity for Philip to be governed; and the function was now principally shared by his Queen and his Confessor, the Jesuit Daubenton. While one alarmed his mind with religious terrors, the other soothed it with connubial joys. Alberoni's influence was chiefly exercised by means of the Queen; but he shared it with her ancient nurse, Laura Pescatori. A young wife, an old nurse, a priest, and a political adventurer; such was the *camarilla* of the Escorial! Laura Pescatori had some unpleasant recollections about the bells of Piacenza; but Alberoni was not proud; he condescended to flatter her and study her tastes; he loaded her with presents, and spared no pains to make her his friend. But his own abilities also befriended him, and his bold and ambitious views, which suited the temper of the Queen. He aimed at restoring Spain to the rank to which she seemed entitled by her extent, her resources, and the character of her inhabitants. He pursued the labours commenced by his predecessor, Orri, for the restoration of the finances; in which task he was assisted as well by the wholesome amputations of territory which Spain had experienced, and which curtailed much needless expenditure, as by the suppression of the privileges of Aragon and Catalonia. Several plans occupied the imagination of Alberoni and his Sovereign, when the finances should have been re-established, and the naval and military forces of the kingdom restored to their ancient

vigour. As the throne of Spain was to descend to Philip V.'s son by his first wife, Elizabeth wished to secure for her own children the Duchies of Parma and Tuscany, as well as the reversion to the throne of France, in case of the death of Louis XV., a sickly boy of fifteen years. To effect this latter object it would be necessary to deprive the Duke of Orleans of the French Regency, and to change the order of succession in Great Britain in favour of the Pretender; in a word, to overthrow the Treaty of Utrecht. But in order to mature these plans, and prepare the means necessary for their execution, Alberoni demanded five years of peace; and, therefore, after the death of Louis XIV., in opposition to the counsels of Cardinal del Giudice, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, he made advances to Great Britain and Holland. On December 15th, 1715, a Commercial Treaty was concluded with England on terms very favourable to this kingdom.

The exhausted state of France and the enormous debt contracted by the late wars also rendered peace necessary to that country, where the Regency had been seized by Louis XIV.'s nephew, Philip Duke of Orleans. Louis had by his will appointed a Council of Regency, of which, indeed, the Duke of Orleans was to be the nominal chief, but with a preponderating voice only in case opinions were divided; and as the Duke du Maine, Louis's natural but legitimated son, had, by the same instrument, been intrusted with the guardianship of the young King, a general expectation had prevailed that he would dispute the Regency with the Duke of Orleans. But Du Maine had not the qualities requisite for such an enterprise; while the Duke of Orleans, though a voluptuary, could rouse himself when occasion called, and especially in matters which concerned his own interest. He resolved to seize the Regency by means of the Parliament of Paris. Accompanied by the Princes of the Blood, the legitimated Princes, and the Dukes and Peers, he proceeded, on the morning after Louis XIV.'s death, to the Palais, where the Parliament was assembled, and was received by that body with respect. In his address to them he insisted on his right to the Regency, both by his birth and by the wishes of the late King, verbally expressed to him. He protested that it was his intention to relieve the people of their burdens, to re-establish the finances, to preserve the peace, to restore unity and tranquillity in the Church; above all, he flattered the Parliament, by demanding beforehand "the wise admonitions of that august assembly." When he had thus predisposed the mind of the Parliament in his favour, the will of

Louis XIV. was read amid a silence of disapprobation. Philip then protested against an act which, he said, had been extorted from the late King; he silenced the attempted remonstrances of the Duke du Maine, and the Parliament proclaimed him Regent by acclamation. He was also invested with the guardianship of the young King, and with the command of the forces; in short, he was intrusted with an almost absolute power, and the testament of Louis, as, indeed, that Sovereign had anticipated, was entirely set aside.

The state of France, as we have said, rendered two objects of paramount necessity—to keep the peace, that is, to observe the Treaty of Utrecht, and to restore the finances. Into this last subject, which belongs to the domestic history of France, we cannot enter. It will suffice to remark that the chief feature of the Regent's financial administration was his adoption of the schemes of the adventurer Law; the establishment of a national bank for the issue of paper money, and the erection of the gigantic commercial monopoly of the Mississippi Company, the shares in which were to be purchased with the notes of the bank.[1] The sudden prosperity of this scheme, the gambling frenzy which it created in the nation, the bursting of the bubble, and the utter ruin of the credulous shareholders, found an exact counterpart in the fury of the South Sea Scheme in England, which was excited by the Mississippi speculation and ended with a similar result.

The foreign policy of the Regent, from whatever motive adopted, though often vehemently attacked by French patriots, was much better than his domestic policy, and the only one suitable to France at that juncture. It would have been impossible to continue buying glory at the price paid for it by Louis XIV. The Regent's policy, guided by the Abbé Dubois, prevented the outbreak of a general war, put an end to that begun by Spain, and compelled the Courts of Vienna and Madrid to terminate their quarrels. All the engagements contracted by the Regent were conformable to the Treaty of Utrecht, and necessary to be maintained for the interests of France herself as well as of Europe. The connection between France and Spain, established at the expense of so much blood and treasure by Louis XIV., was at once severed by his death. The relationship between the ruling families, instead of a bond of union, proved a source of discord, and served only to embitter the political disputes between the two coun-

[1] The English reader will find a description of Law's proceedings in Paris in Lord Russell's *Europe from the Peace of Utrecht*, vol. ii. ch. 3.

tries. So futile is the expectation that the policy of nations may be influenced for any length of time by the ties of kindred!

At first, however, the policy of the Duke of Orleans seemed undecided. As Spain had approached George I.,[1] so the Regent appeared inclined to adopt the cause of the Pretender. He, at all events, permitted James, who had been residing in Lorraine since the Peace, to traverse France in order to embark at Dunkirk for his descent on Scotland in December, 1715. The result of that abortive enterprise is well known to the English reader. After its conclusion the Pretender retired to Avignon. Both Philip V. and the Regent, however, soon began to appreciate better their true interests and position. Part of their policy, may, perhaps, be justly ascribed to personal dislike. Their characters were entirely opposite, except that idleness was the sultana queen of both. Philip V. had conceived a perfect hatred for his cousin, and firmly believed all the crimes which rumour imputed to him. He had formed the design of claiming the Regency of France on the death of Louis XIV.; but when the moment arrived, he could not summon courage to cross the Pyrenees.

As Philip V. was governed by Alberoni, so the Regent was guided by the Abbé Dubois, who had been his preceptor. The rise of Dubois was almost as extraordinary as that of the Spanish Minister. He was the son of an apothecary at Brives-la-Gaillarde, a small town in the Limousin, and was born September 6th, 1656. Sent to Paris by his parents at the early age of twelve, and almost abandoned to his own resources, he was only too happy to obtain the means of studying at the College St. Michael, or Pompadour, by becoming the servant of the principal.[2] After completing his studies and serving as tutor in several families, he at length obtained a preceptorship in that of the Marquis de Pluvant, master of the wardrobe to *Monsieur*, the Duke of Orleans, brother of Louis XIV. Here he formed the acquaintance of M. de St. Laurent, tutor to Monsieur's son, the Duke of Chartres, afterwards the Regent; and finding thus an introduction to the Orleans family, with whom he contrived to ingratiate himself, he was, on the death of St. Laurent, appointed to succeed to his office. Under Dubois's care the natural abilities of the young Duke of Chartres were developed with a rapidity which delighted the Court; but at the same time he is believed to have secretly pandered to the premature vices of his pupil. Whilst

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. ii. p. 218.

[2] For an account of Dubois, see Sevelinges, *Mém. Secrets du Cardinal Dubois.*

serving in this capacity Dubois gained the favour of Louis XIV. by bringing about a match between the Duke of Chartres and the King's natural, but legitimated daughter, Mdlle. de Blois, in spite of the opposition of the Duchess of Orleans. In reward for this service Louis gave him the Abbey of St. Just in Picardy, and subsequently permitted him to join the embassy of Marshal Tallard at London. Here he threw aside his ecclesiastical costume, took the title of the Chevalier du Bois, and with the assistance of St. Evremont made some distinguished acquaintances. That of Lord Stanhope in particular afterwards became the source of his extraordinary political fortune.

On the death of *Monsieur*, in 1701, Dubois, with the modest title of secretary, became in fact the intimate adviser of his former pupil, the new Duke of Orleans. He had accompanied the Duke in his first campaign under Marshal Luxembourg, and was present at the battle of Steinkerque (1692), where he displayed all the courage and coolness of a professional soldier. But when in 1707 the Duke proceeded to Spain to take the command of the army, the Princess des Ursins, who dreaded Dubois's intriguing spirit, caused him to be excluded from the Prince's suite. The elevation of the Duke of Orleans to the Regency inspired Dubois with the hope of realizing all his most ambitious dreams. One thing, however, stood in his way. His character was so notorious for dissoluteness and utter want of principle, that even the Regent himself, who knew his abilities and loved him for some congenial qualities, hesitated to incur the reproach of making him a Minister. But an appeal to their long friendship touched the Regent's heart, and with the admonition, "Abbé, a little probity, I beg," he named him Counsellor of State. Such was the man who was to direct for some time the policy of France, and play a leading part in the affairs of Europe. He was now in his sixtieth year, ruined alike in health and reputation, and still only an *abbé;* no time, therefore, was to be lost in pushing his fortune. In person he was slender, light complexioned, with a sly and fox-like expression of countenance.

Dubois took a rapid and correct view of the state of Europe, in the interest of his master. This interest was twofold: to assure the possession of the Regency, and to secure the French throne in the line of Orleans, instead of that of Philip V., in case of the death of Louis XV. To accomplish this an alliance was to be made with England; the interest of that country in excluding the King of Spain from the French Succession being identical

with that of the Regent. George I. had need of such an alliance. France was the only Power which could lend any material aid to the Pretender, the so-called James III.; while, on the other hand, without the aid of England, Philip V. stood no chance of prevailing against the Duke of Orleans.[1] The policy of the French and English alliance was thus founded principally on views of family interest; but this interest fortunately coincided with that of the two nations, and indeed of all Europe, for which peace was a necessity.

The return of the Whigs to power on the accession of George I. had drawn closer the relations between England and the Dutch Republic, and thus promised to facilitate the accession of the States-General to the contemplated alliance. Holland was become almost a satellite of Great Britain, to which she looked for the maintenance of her barrier. The ancient alliance between the two countries was renewed by the Treaty of Westminster, February 17th, 1716, by which former treaties were confirmed. George I., with an eye to his newly-acquired Duchies of Bremen and Verden, had also concluded a defensive alliance with the Emperor, Charles VI. (May 25th).[2] On the other hand, the Whigs, as well as George I. himself, had always loudly expressed their dissatisfaction at the Treaty of Utrecht; they had denounced the Tories as the authors of it, and it was a delicate task to require them to turn round and support it. The clamours, too, against France had been increased by the aid recently afforded to the Pretender, and by the continuation of the works at Mardyck. Thus many difficulties stood in the way of Dubois's project; but they were at length surmounted by his skill and perseverance. Finding that Lord Stanhope was to pass through Holland in July, 1716, with George I., on his way to Hanover, Dubois repaired to the Hague on pretence of collecting books and objects of *virtù*; where, as if by chance, he contrived to have an interview with his old acquaintance, the English minister. He availed himself of the opportunity to open and recommend his plans; matters were prepared for a treaty, and, in the following August, Dubois went to Hanover, where the alliance was finally arranged. The States-General, fearful of offending the Emperor, manifested at first great reluctance to accede to the treaty; but these scruples being at length overcome, the Triple Alliance was signed at the Hague, January 4th, 1717. By this treaty the provisions contained in the Treaty of Utrecht were renewed;

[1] Martin, t. xv. p. 80. [2] Dumont, t. viii. pt. i. p. 477.

Louis XV. promised never to aid the Pretender, and to induce him to cross the Alps; fresh stipulations were made respecting the destruction of the works at Dunkirk and Mardyck; and it was agreed that English commissaries should be appointed to see that this Article was faithfully executed.[1]

Although this treaty was favourable to England, it experienced much opposition from the Whigs. The Regent conciliated Pitt, the leader of that party and father of the celebrated Lord Chatham, by the present of a magnificent diamond. The alliance was also most unwelcome to the Emperor, although there appears to have been an understanding among the parties to it that he should obtain Sicily in exchange for Sardinia. On receipt of the news he wrote to the States-General that the Barrier Treaty was at an end; but this was a mere threat. Nobody, however, was so vexed and surprised as the King of Spain. Relying on his treaty with England, Philip deemed himself secure of that Power, and when the Regent communicated to him the project of the Triple Alliance, he had replied with indifference. Alberoni, however, persuaded him at present to digest his anger. That minister was not yet prepared to act, and wished to postpone a war till he should have accumulated the necessary resources to conduct it with vigour. For this purpose he had obtained the Pope's permission to levy a tax on the Spanish clergy, under the pretence of assisting the Venetians in the war they were then waging with the Turks; and, indeed, he actually despatched a force of 8,000 men to assist in the defence of Corfû. But before his preparations were complete, he was hurried into a war with the Emperor by a comparatively trivial incident. In May, 1717, the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, in returning from Rome, ventured to traverse the Milanese without an Imperial passport, and was arrested as a rebellious subject of Charles III. of Spain! Exasperated by this insult, Philip V. declared that he would immediately vindicate the honour of his Crown. In vain did Alberoni remonstrate and represent to Philip that he had but the rudiments of a fleet and army; Philip was inflexible, and all that the minister could obtain was that hostilities should first be directed against the Island of Sardinia, instead of Naples and Sicily. Alberoni, finding himself thus prematurely driven into a war by the hastiness of his Sovereign, resolved to surprise Europe by the boldness of his measures. But, first of all, to secure himself a retreat in case of failure, he extorted from the Pope a cardinal's hat, partly by threats, and

[1] Dumont, t. viii. pt. i. p. 484; Lamberty, *Mém.* t. x. p. 1.

partly by representing the services he had rendered to the Venetians in their struggle with the Turks. Matters being thus arranged, an armament was despatched for the conquest of Sardinia. Nine thousand Spaniards were landed there towards the end of August, 1717; and, with the aid of the discontented inhabitants, got possession of the whole island in less than three months.[1]

One of the first effects of this attack on the Emperor's western possessions was to hamper him in his wars and negotiations with the Ottoman Porte. But to explain this matter, it will be necessary to take a short retrospect of Turkish history.

We have already recorded the peace concluded between the Sultan and the Czar, and how Charles XII. of Sweden was subsequently compelled to quit the Turkish dominions.[2] One of the chief motives with the Porte for assuring tranquillity on this side was that it might turn its arms elsewhere. Great activity was observed in the Turkish arsenals, but the object of it was long uncertain. The Emperor, then engaged in the war of the Spanish Succession, assembled, in 1714, an army of observation of 50,000 men in Hungary and Transylvania. It appeared at last that the mighty preparations of the Turks were directed against Venice, with the view of recovering the Morea, a loss which the Porte had not been able to brook. In December, 1714, the Venetian *Bailo* at Constantinople was informed, in the grossest terms, by the Grand Vizier Damad Ali Pasha that it was the intention of his master not to rest till he had recovered the Morea: he was directed to leave Constantinople in three days, and, together with all other Venetians, the Turkish territories in three weeks; but before that time had expired he was imprisoned in the castle of the Dardanelles, and his suite of forty-two persons in the Seven Towers, as hostages for the safety of Turkish subjects in the Venetian dominions. The *Signoria*, relying on a peace guaranteed by the Emperor, had made but small preparations for defence. Their rule in the Morea was highly unpopular. The inhabitants preferred the Turkish Government as both cheaper and less oppressive,[3] and were not, therefore, disposed to fight in the cause of their Venetian masters. Hence, when the Turks entered the

[1] Alberoni was very generally accused by his contemporaries of having been the author of this war; but it is now acknowledged that it was undertaken against his will. See Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. ii. p. 275 sq.

[2] Vol. iii. p. 523 sq.

[3] De la Motraye, *Voyages*, t. i. p. 462. On the Venetian government of the Morea (1685-1715), see Ranke, *Hist. u. Pol. Zeitschrift*, B. ii. S. 405 ff.; Finlay, *Greece under Othoman and Venetian Domination*.

Morea in the summer of 1715, the inhabitants in many places hastened to submit; and as the Venetians were neither strong enough to cope with the Turks in the open field, nor the fortresses of the peninsula in a state to resist a lengthened siege, the whole of the Morea was wrested from them in the course of a few months. For not defending some of these towns, rendered defenceless by their own neglect, the *Signoria* threw the commandants into prison for life.

The Emperor was alarmed at the sudden and decisive success of the Turks; and as Louis XIV. had died during the campaign, he was the more disposed to listen to the prayers of the Venetians for help. He was strongly exhorted to this step by Prince Eugene, who represented to him the danger that would accrue to his Italian, and even to his German, States, if the Turks should get possession of the Ionian Islands. A treaty of alliance was accordingly signed with the *Signoria*, April 13th, 1716. It purported to be a renewal of the Holy League of 1684, and the *casus belli* against the Porte was, therefore, the violation of the Peace of Carlowitz; but, instead of being merely directed against that Power, it was extended to a general defensive alliance with the Venetian Republic. Under the energetic superintendence of Eugene, the preparations for war were soon completed. In the course of April three Austrian divisions entered Hungary, Eugene himself being at the head of the largest, of 70,000 men. On the other hand, the Grand Vizier, with 100,000 men, marched towards Belgrade; while the agents of the Porte incited to insurrection the malcontent Hungarians, and their leader Ragoczy, who aimed at obtaining the principality of Transylvania, and even the title of King of Hungary. The Vizier having attacked Eugene in his fortified camp before Peterwardein, on August 3rd, that commander offered him battle on the 5th, in which the Vizier himself was slain, and the Turks utterly defeated. This victory is principally ascribed to the use of heavy cavalry, with which the Turks were as yet unacquainted. The fruits of it were the surrender of Temesvar; and even Wallachia declared for the Emperor; a manifestation, however, which led to no result. In the same year an attempt of the Turks upon Corfû was repulsed, chiefly through the military talents of Baron Schulenburg, whom we have already met with in the Polish War, and whose services the Venetians had procured.

The Porte, discouraged by these reverses, made proposals to the Emperor for a peace early in 1717; and Sir Wortley Montague

and Count Colyer, the English and Dutch residents at Constantinople, endeavoured to forward this object by their mediation.[1] But their offers were not listened to. In the spring, Eugene took the command of 140,000 men, and many princes and nobles flocked to his standard as volunteers, desirous of sharing the renown of so distinguished a commander. He now directed his march on Belgrade, near which place he was attacked, on August 16th, by a much superior Turkish force, which, however, he entirely defeated. Belgrade capitulated on the 18th. The Porte now renewed its offers of peace. Eugene declined to treat except on the basis of *uti possidetis;* and the Cabinet of Vienna insisted that Venice should be included in the treaty. As the Porte had obtained some advantages over the Venetians in the course of the year, it was at first unwilling to concede this point. In the spring of 1718, Eugene increased his demands by requiring the cession of Bosnia, Servia, and Wallachia. But the hostile attitude assumed by Spain induced the Emperor to lower his terms. He abandoned his pretensions to Wallachia and the other provinces, but insisted on the basis of *uti possidetis,* which the Turks at last agreed to accept, as well as to abandon the cause of Ragoczy. A congress was now assembled at Passarowitz, which was opened by a speech of Sir Robert Sutton, as English mediator, June 5th. Although the Emperor had pretended to enter into the war on account of the Venetians, they were made the scape-goats of the peace, as the *uti possidetis* of course deprived them of the Morea, while Charles VI. retained all his conquests. Thus the Peace of Passarowitz (July 21st, 1718), gave a mortal blow to the power of Venice in the East.[2] But to return to the affairs of Western Europe.

Although victor at Peterwardein and Belgrade, some time must elapse before the Emperor could freely wield all his forces against Spain, and he therefore appealed to the Triple Alliance against the violation of Italian neutrality. Alberoni, on the other hand, sought to propitiate England by some commercial advantages, and strained every nerve to raise men and money. Under these circumstances, France and England entered into a convention in July, 1718, to the following effect. The Emperor was to be compelled to renounce all pretensions to Spain and the Indies, and Philip V. to the ancient Spanish provinces of which the Emperor was now in possession, as well as to the reversion of Sicily in case of failure of heirs in the

[1] This is the period of the well-known *Letters* of Lady Montague, the wife of the English envoy.

[2] The treaty is in Katona, t. xxxviii. p. 371 sqq.

House of Savoy. Sicily was to be assigned to the Emperor, the Duke of Savoy taking Sardinia instead, with the title of King. The Emperor was to promise the eventual investiture of the Duchies of Parma and Tuscany to Don Carlos, or another son of the Queen of Spain;[1] but with a provision that they should never be united with the Crown of Spain; and Leghorn, Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza were to be provisionally occupied by Swiss garrisons, in the pay of the mediating Powers. Three months were to be allowed to Philip V. and the Duke of Savoy to accede to the treaty after its ratification by the Emperor; and in case of refusal their accession was to be enforced.[2] The Emperor immediately agreed to these terms, and on August 2nd was signed at London the treaty known as the QUADRUPLE ALLIANCE,[3] so called because the Dutch were also invited to accede to it. But these Republicans, offended at not having been previously consulted, and alarmed for their trade with Spain, refused at first to do so; and their accession was not obtained till six months later. The King of Spain, and also, at first, the Duke of Savoy, refused to accede to the treaty; but the latter gave his consent to it in November.

All these negotiations were the work of Stanhope and Dubois. Alberoni had attempted to oppose one coalition by another; and as already related,[4] he tried to reconcile the Czar and the King of Sweden, and unite them in a descent on Scotland in favour of the Pretender. But this project failed, as well as his attempt to prevent the Turks from concluding the Peace of Passarowitz with the Emperor. He had already prepared to strike a blow by landing 30,000 Spaniards at Palermo, which was effected July 1st, 1718. A great part of the Piedmontese troops had already been withdrawn, and the rest now retired into the citadel of Messina. Alberoni had attempted to persuade Philip V. to direct the Sicilian force against England, and thus to pierce the Quadruple Alliance in the heart;[5] but the King very prudently declined so hazardous an enterprise. In June a British fleet was despatched to the Mediterranean, and Stanhope hastened to Madrid to make a last effort to obtain the submission of Philip. While he was at Madrid, news arrived of the landing of the Spaniards at Palermo, and Stanhope offered to restore Gibraltar if Philip would immediately accede to the Quadruple Alliance; but without effect.[6] Admiral Byng

[1] Elizabeth Farnese's claims on Tuscany were derived from her grandmother, daughter of Cosmo II.

[2] Martin, t. xv. p. 90 sq.

[3] Dumont, t. viii. pt. i. p. 531; Lamberty, t. x. *Suite*, p. 40.

[4] See vol. iii. p. 529.

[5] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. ii. p. 316.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 328 (Ed. London, 1815).

almost annihilated the Spanish fleet of twenty-two sail in an engagement off Syracuse, August 11th.[1] Yet the Allied Powers still hesitated to make a formal declaration of war. England was unwilling to do so except in conjunction with France, and the Regent was reluctant to take such a step against the grandson of Louis XIV. At last Dubois, who was now minister for Foreign Affairs, found a pretext for it in the conspiracy of Cellamare.

Alberoni, in conjunction with the Duchess du Maine, and through Cellamare, the Spanish ambassador at Paris, had concocted an absurd plot for surprising and carrying off the Regent; upon which Philip V. was to claim the Regency, and to procure confirmation of his authority from an assembly of the States-General of France. This precious scheme was betrayed to Dubois by a clerk employed to copy the despatches, and a Spanish abbé, the bearer of them, was arrested at Poitiers on his way to Spain. This discovery was followed by the arrest of the Duchess du Maine and her husband, as well as that of Cellamare, as a violator of international law; and Dubois availed himself of the popular indignation excited by the plot to declare war against Spain, January 10th, 1719.[2] An English declaration had preceded it by a fortnight. Dubois could afford to treat with contempt so foolish a conspiracy, in which, besides the immediate concoctors, the Cardinal de Polignac was the only considerable person concerned. The culprits were dismissed, and Cellamare returned to Spain.

Active operations were commenced in the spring. In April a French division crossed the Bidasoa, pushed on to Passages and destroyed the dockyard, where several men-of-war were building; then being joined by the main body under Marshal Berwick, laid siege to Fuenterabia, which capitulated June 18th. Philip was unable to stem this invasion; yet in March he had despatched six ships of war, with 6,000 men, and arms for 30,000 more, to make a descent in Scotland under the conduct of the exiled Duke of Ormond. The Pretender was invited from Rome to take advantage of any events which might occur. But the Spanish squadron was dispersed by a storm; only two frigates succeeded in reaching Kintail, and the partial rising of Highlanders which ensued was

[1] M. Martin says: "Aucune signification, aucune déclaration de guerre, n'avait eu lieu." (*Hist. de France*, t. xv. p. 94.) Only the latter part of this sentence is true. The destination of the fleet had been communicated in the spring to Monteleon, the Spanish ambassador at London. Coxe, *ibid.* p. 310.

[2] The Declaration was written by the celebrated Fontenelle.

speedily quelled. In Spain, St. Sebastian surrendered to the French August 19th. Berwick then re-entered France; skirted with his army the northern side of the Pyrenees, and entered Cerdagne; where, however, he effected little or nothing. In the autumn an English fleet appeared off the coast of Galicia, captured Vigo, October 21st, and did much damage.

It was clearly impossible for Spain to resist, single-handed, the formidable combination organized against her. The Austrian troops, released by the Peace of Passarowitz, had now had time to proceed to the scene of action, and the English fleet had landed large bodies of them in Sicily. The French invasion of Spain would recommence next year, and the English were preparing to attack Spanish America. But the French and English Cabinets had resolved that the fall of Alberoni should be an indispensable condition of a peace. Philip V. was influenced to dismiss his enterprising minister through his confessor Daubenton, whom Dubois had gained; while the Spanish Queen was threatened with the withdrawal of the guarantee of the Italian Duchies to her children. Alberoni, who had dissuaded the war (p. 46), was made the sacrifice of the peace which concluded it. In December, 1719, he received orders to quit Madrid in eight days and Spain in three weeks. This was the end of his political career, though he lived till 1752. He retired through France to Genoa; whence, however, he was driven by Pope Clement XI., who threatened him with prosecution as an enemy of the Catholic faith. Till the death of that Pontiff he found a refuge in Switzerland; and after that event he regained his place in the Consistory.

After the dismissal of Alberoni, the Spanish ambassador at the Hague acceded to the Quadruple Alliance (February, 1720). The Emperor was put in possession of Sicily; the ex-King of Sicily (Victor Amadeus II. of Savoy) became King of Sardinia, a possession which has since remained in his House; and the reversion of Parma and Tuscany was guaranteed to the children of the Spanish Queen. The policy of Dubois was thus crowned with success, and it was not surprising that he should look for his reward. The method of it lay in ecclesiastical preferment. Might not the son of the apothecary at Brives as justly aspire to a cardinal's hat as the gardener's son of Piacenza? But if this was a striking analogy, the invasion of the Archbishopric of Cambray, so recently occupied by the virtuous Fénelon, was as glaring a contrast. The eloquent Masillon was one of the two prelates who became on this occasion the necessary sponsors for Dubois's morality! For the attainment

of the hat the most incongruous machinery was set in motion. The affair was mooted by an application of the Protestant King of England to the atheistical Regent; and the Catholic Pretender, then resident at Rome, who interceded for Dubois, is supposed to have been bought with the guineas of George I.![1] But Clement XI. contrived all his lifetime to evade the application. Dubois, on Clement's death, inverted the parts of patron and client, and promised the tiara to any Cardinal who would give him the hat. Cardinal Conti, a very old man, became Pope on these terms, with the title of Innocent XIII.; and Dubois, after a few more delays, obtained the object of his ambition.

The accession of Philip V. to the Quadruple Alliance was followed by several treaties. As the Emperor had shown symptoms that he did not mean to execute his share of that alliance, by carrying out the stipulations regarding the Italian Duchies, Philip concluded a secret treaty with France in March, 1721, by which that country engaged to support the interests of Spain in the Congress about to be opened at Cambray.[2] The English Cabinet manifested their displeasure at this treaty, which had been made without their concurrence; and Dubois, to appease them, hastened to bring about another between Great Britain and Spain, to which France also acceded, containing terms very advantageous to English commerce. On the other hand, Great Britain engaged to replace the Spanish ships destroyed by Byng.[3]

The connection between France and Spain was at this time drawn closer by some marriage contracts between the reigning families. Louis XV. was to be affianced to the Infanta, then only three years of age, who was to be educated in France; while the Prince of Asturias, the heir apparent of the Spanish Monarchy, and Don Carlos, the heir of Parma and Tuscany, were to be united to two daughters of the Regent Orleans. The young princesses were exchanged on the Bidasoa, January 9th, 1722. These marriages had been effected through the influence of Daubenton, and at the expense of religious freedom in France. Under Philip V., the slave of the Jesuits, religious bigotry and intolerance flourished as vigorously as under the House of Austria; 2,346 persons were burnt during his reign,[4] and the consort of the Prince of Asturias was regaled on her arrival in Spain with the spectacle of an *auto de fé*. Daubenton procured that the Jesuit Limières should succeed

[1] Dubois is said to have received a pension from George I.

[2] Martin, t. xv. p. 114.

[3] Dumont, t. viii. pt. ii. p. 33 sqq.

[4] Lémontey, *Hist. de la Régence*, t. i. p. 431.

the venerable Abbé Fleuri as confessor of Louis XV.; the press and book trade in France were subjected to a rigorous surveillance, and Fleuri's posthumous work, the *Discours sur les Libertés Gallicanes*, was suppressed.

The term of the Orleans regency was now approaching. Louis XV. would attain his legal majority February 16th, 1723, and the Regent had caused him to be crowned in October, 1722. When the King became major, the Duke of Orleans resigned the title of Regent, but as president of the Council of State continued to conduct the Government under the guidance of Dubois, who was now Prime Minister. The Cardinal, however, did not long enjoy his newly-acquired honours. He died on August 10th, 1723, from the results of a painful operation, rendered necessary by his former habits of profligacy. The Duke of Orleans did not long survive him. He also became the victim of his debauches, and was carried off by an apoplexy, December 2nd, 1723, at the premature age of forty-nine. The Duke of Bourbon now became Prime Minister. His administration was but a continuation of the former system, though with infinitely less talent.

Soon after these events Europe was surprised by the abdication of Philip V. It is difficult to determine whether this act was the result of his hypochondriac malady or of a deep political design. If it was madness it was not without method. The health of Louis XV. was at that time supposed to be in a declining state, and in case of his death the European Powers would hardly allow the French Crown to be assumed by the King of Spain. Couriers were stationed between Paris and Madrid to bring the speediest intelligence, and preparations were made for a journey to France at the charming retreat which Philip had prepared for himself at St. Ildefonso.[1] The Crown of Spain was transferred to Don Louis, Prince of Asturias, then sixteen years of age, Philip's eldest son, by Louisa of Savoy (January 10th, 1724). But—such are the contrarieties which attend the best laid schemes—Louis XV. survived, and Don Louis died of the small-pox in the August following his accession! Philip was now in a difficult position. His renunciation of the Crown had resembled a solemn religious act, and his resumption of it, under the circumstances, might occasion unfavourable comments. His religious scruples, however, were removed by the Papal Nuncio; after much apparent reluctance, Philip again ascended the throne, and Elizabeth Farnese reigned once more, to the detriment of the peace of Europe.

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 50 sqq.

Meanwhile a congress had been opened at Cambray to decide the questions between Austria and Spain. The Duke of Bourbon was inclined to support Spain, and to form an intimate alliance with that country; but he was governed by his mistress, Madame de Prie, who had been bought by Walpole, the English minister, and inherited Dubois's English policy, together with his pension. The effrontery of this woman brought about a crisis in the policy of Europe. Bourbon had not face enough to make Madame de Prie's complaisant husband a duke and peer of France; but he solicited for him a Spanish grandeeship—a request which was scornfully refused by the Court of Madrid. Madame de Prie revenged herself by persuading the Duke of Bourbon to get Louis XV. married at once, instead of waiting till the Spanish Infanta should become marriageable; and that Princess was sent back to Spain without even a word of apology (April, 1725). The French Court at first endeavoured to procure for the young King a granddaughter of George I.; but it was, of course, impossible that a Sovereign who held his throne by virtue of his Protestant tenets should consent to such a match. Mary Leszczinska, daughter of Stanislaus, ex-King of Poland, was then selected to be Queen of France. The family of Stanislaus was at that time residing at Weissembourg, in Alsace, on a small pension allowed them by the French Government, and were not a little surprised and delighted at this unexpected turn in their fortunes. Mary, who was nearly seven years older than Louis, was married to him September 4th, 1725.

The dismissal of the Infanta naturally gave the deepest offence to the Spanish Court. Philip immediately recalled his ambassador from Paris, and his ministers from the Congress of Cambray, which was consequently broken up; and he declared that he would never be reconciled with France till Bourbon should come to Madrid and beg pardon on his knees. Yet he had himself been secretly preparing to inflict the very same insult of which he so grievously complained. Philip, when he found it impossible to come to any terms with the French Court, and that nothing was likely to be done at the Congress of Cambray, had reconciled himself with the Emperor, Charles VI. The Baron Ripperda, a Dutchman, who had turned Catholic and had contrived to replace Alberoni, of whom he was a sort of parody, in the confidence of Queen Elizabeth, had been despatched, in the autumn of 1724, to Vienna, with secret instructions to negotiate a marriage between her son, Don Carlos—already affianced, as we have seen, to Mdlle.

Beaujolais—and the eldest Archduchess, Maria Theresa.[1] Almost the sole object of the Emperor's policy at that juncture, he being without male heirs, was to secure the succession of his daughters, according to the PRAGMATIC SANCTION which he had promulgated in 1713. By this instrument the Austrian succession was regulated in the order of primogeniture, first in favour of his male descendants, and, in their default, of females. In case these also should be wanting, Charles next appointed the Archduchesses, daughters of the Emperor Joseph; then the Queen of Portugal and other daughters of the Emperor Leopold, and their descendants in perpetuity.[2] As he advanced in years, the Emperor, despairing of male issue, caused the Pragmatic Sanction to be confirmed by the Austrian States, and by those of Silesia, Bohemia, and Hungary. The weak point of it was that Charles's daughters were named to the succession before those of his elder brother, the Emperor Joseph I.; and this in the face of a contrary Act of Succession made by his father, the Emperor Leopold, in 1703, by which it was provided that, in default of male heirs, the Austrian inheritance should first fall to the daughters of Joseph.[3] By cancelling this arrangement Charles VI. indicated that a like fate might overtake his own, nay, make indeed a precedent for it; and hence his anxiety to obtain a confirmation of the Pragmatic Sanction from foreign Powers as well as from his own subjects. To procure the guarantee of Spain, he was inclined to meet the advances of that Power; while Philip, after the dismissal of his daughter from France, urged Ripperda to conclude with the Cabinet of Vienna almost at any price. Two treaties, a public and a secret one, were accordingly signed at Vienna April 30th. By the former, the two Sovereigns mutually renounced their claims to each other's dominions; Philip guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction and opened the Spanish ports to German commerce; while Charles promised to use his good offices to procure the restoration of Gibraltar and Minorca to the Spanish Crown, and recognized Don Carlos as heir to Parma and Tuscany. The assent of the Germanic body to this arrangement respecting the Italian duchies was expressed in a subsequent treaty between the Emperor, the Empire, and Spain, signed June 7th, 1725.[4]

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 101. Ripperda had been the Dutch ambassador at Madrid in 1715; in which capacity he attracted the notice of Alberoni, and gained the confidence of Philip V. by his insinuating manners, who took him into his service. Garden, *Traités de Paix*, t. iii. p. 135, note.

[2] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 127.

[3] Pfeffel, *Abrégé chronol. de l'Histoire d'Allemagne*, t. ii. p. 453.

[4] Dumont, t. viii. pt. ii. pp. 106, 113, and 121; Lamberty, t. x. *Suite*, p. 128.

By these treaties Philip renounced all the advantages which he had hoped to obtain through the mediating Powers at the Congress of Cambray, and acquiesced in the provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht and of the Quadruple Alliance. They contained nothing, therefore, calculated to offend either England or France; but such was not the case with the Secret Treaty. Nothing, of course, was certainly known of this except through the imprudent and foolish boasting of Ripperda; but it was believed that marriages had been arranged between the two Archduchesses, Maria Theresa and Maria Anna, and Don Carlos and Don Philip, the sons of Philip V. by Elizabeth Farnese; that the contracting parties had agreed to effect the restoration of the Stuarts; and that the Emperor had engaged to assist Philip in the recovery of Gibraltar and Minorca *by force*. The marriage of Don Carlos might one day revive the Empire of Charles V. through the union of Spain and Germany. The exultation displayed by the Court of Madrid, and the honours lavished upon Ripperda, who was made a minister and grandee of Spain, strengthened the alarm of the French and English Cabinets. Their suspicions were soon confirmed by the confessions of Ripperda himself, whose vanity and presumption brought upon him the hatred of the Spanish grandees, and deprived him of the confidence of the Queen. In a few months he was driven from his office, and took refuge in the hotel of Stanhope, the English Ambassador, to whom he revealed the whole of the negotiations between Spain and the Emperor. Philip dragged him by force from this asylum, and caused him to be confined at Segovia. After these revelations, war seemed inevitable. George I., during his sojourn at Hanover in 1725, engaged Frederick William I. of Prussia to conclude at Herrenhausen an alliance with France and England (September 3rd).[1] The Dutch, in the interests of their commerce, threatened by the establishment of an East India Company by the Emperor at Ostend, acceded to this alliance, known as the Alliance of Hanover, by a treaty signed at the Hague, August 9th, 1726.[2] Sweden and Denmark, which Powers were to be subsidized by England and France, also acceded in March and April, 1727.[3] On the other hand, the Empress of Russia, incensed

[1] Dumont, t. viii. pt. ii. p. 127; Lamberty, t. x. *Suite*, p. 159. This treaty affords the first instance of a Prince of the Empire entering into a formal engagement with a foreign Power not to execute the obligations imposed on him by the Germanic Constitution, viz., to furnish a contingent of troops, in case the Empire should declare war against France. Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iii. p. 140.

[2] Dumont, t. viii. pt. ii. p. 133.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 141 sqq.; Rousset, *Recueil*, t. iii. p. 114.

by the conduct of George I. in protecting Denmark and Sweden against her designs, as will be explained in the next chapter, (see p. 79) joined the Alliance of Vienna August 6th, 1726;[1] and in the following year Frederick William of Prussia, who had never heartily approved of the Hanoverian League, secretly did the same.

Thus all Europe became divided between the alliances of Vienna and Hanover; and though both sides pretended that these treaties were only defensive, yet each made extensive preparations for war. George I. entered into a treaty with the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel for the supply of 12,000 men; manifests were published, ambassadors withdrawn, armies put on foot; the sea was covered with English fleets; an English squadron under Admiral Hosier annoyed the trade of Spain; and in February, 1727, the Spaniards laid siege to Gibraltar, and seized at Vera Cruz a richly laden merchant vessel belonging to the English South Sea Company. But all these vast preparations led to no results of importance. Of all the European Powers, Spain alone had any real desire for war. The mediation of Pope Benedict XIII.,[2] the death of Catherine I. Empress of Russia (May 17th, 1727), the Emperor's principal ally, and above all the pacific character of Cardinal Fleury, the French minister, prevented the outbreak of a war. In June, 1726, Louis XV. had dismissed the Duke of Bourbon and called Fleury to his counsels, who was then seventy-three years of age.[3] Fleury adopted the pacific policy of the two preceding Governments; and nothing can show in a stronger light the necessity of peace for France, which could be maintained only through the *entente cordiale* with Great Britain, than that three statesmen of such different characters as Orleans, Bourbon, and Fleury should have agreed in maintaining it. The preliminaries of a general pacification were signed at Paris, May 31st, 1727, by the ministers of the Emperor, France, Great Britain, and Holland, and a Congress was appointed to assemble at Aix-la-Chapelle to arrange a definitive peace. But Spain still held aloof and sought every opportunity to temporize. The hopes of Philip being again awakened by the death of George I. in July, 1727, he renewed his intrigues with the Jacobites, instigated the Pretender to proceed to a port in the Low Countries, and to seize an opportunity to pass over into England. But these unfounded expectations were soon dispelled by the quiet

[1] Dumont, t. viii. pt. ii. p. 131.

[2] Cardinal Orsini, who had succeeded Innocent XIII. in 1724.

[3] Fleury, however, who must not be confounded with the Abbé of the same name, did not obtain a Cardinal's hat till September, 1726.

accession of George II. to the throne and policy of his father; and by the readiness manifested by his first Parliament to support him with liberal grants of men and money. The Spanish Queen, however, still held out; till, alarmed by the dangerous state of Philip's health, whose death might frustrate her favourite scheme of obtaining the Italian Duchies, and leave her a mere cypher without any political influence, she induced her husband to accept the preliminaries by the Act of the Pardo, March 6th, 1728.[1]

A Congress was now opened at Soissons, to which place it had been transferred for the convenience of Fleury, who was Bishop of it. But though little remained to be arranged except the satisfaction of Spain in the matter of the Italian Duchies, the negotiations were tedious and protracted. Spain, by her large military preparations, seemed still to contemplate a war; and by the conclusion of a double marriage between the Prince of Asturias and the Infanta of Portugal, and the Prince of Brazil and Infanta of Spain (January, 1729), was evidently endeavouring to withdraw Portugal from the English alliance. The Spanish Queen still entertained an implacable resentment against France and England, and spared no exertion to bring the Emperor into her views. But the conduct of that Sovereign at length undeceived her. In order to obtain the guarantee of all the Powers to the Pragmatic Sanction, the sum of all his policy, he raised every obstacle to the negotiations. He thwarted the Spanish interests with regard to the Italian Duchies, by objecting to the introduction of Spanish garrisons, and by reviving obsolete pretensions of the Empire to Parmesan and Tuscan fiefs, so as to diminish the value of those inheritances. Thus the negotiations at Soissons became a mere farce, and the various plenipotentiaries gradually withdrew from the Congress. Meanwhile the birth of a Dauphin (September 4th, 1729) having dissipated the hopes of Philip V. and his Queen as to the French succession, Elizabeth devoted herself all the more warmly to the prosecution of her Italian schemes; and finding all her efforts to separate France and England unavailing, she at length determined to accept what they offered. She had previously tested the Emperor's sincerity by demanding that the Italian fortresses should be occupied by Spanish, instead of neutral troops, and by requiring a categorical answer with regard to the projected marriage between the Archduchess and Don Carlos. The Emperor having returned an

[1] Dumont, t. viii. pt. ii. pp. 146, 150; Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 231.

evasive answer, she persuaded Philip to enter into a separate treaty with France and England, which was concluded at Seville November 9th, 1729.[1] England and Spain arranged their commercial and other differences; the succession of Don Carlos to the Italian Duchies was guaranteed; and it was agreed that Leghorn, Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza should be garrisoned by 6,000 Spaniards, who, however, were not to interfere with the civil government. Nothing more was said about Gibraltar. Philip, indeed, seemed now to have abandoned all hope of recovering that fortress; for he soon afterwards caused to be constructed across the isthmus the strong lines of San Roque, and thus completely isolated Gibraltar from his Spanish dominions. The Dutch acceded to the Treaty of Seville shortly after its execution,[2] on the understanding that they should receive entire satisfaction respecting the India Company established by the Emperor at Ostend.

Charles VI. was indignant at being thus treated by Spain, in violation of all the engagements which the Spanish Sovereigns had so recently contracted with him; and above all was he disappointed at seeing his hopes frustrated of obtaining a guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. He recalled his ambassador from Madrid, and despatched a considerable force into the Milanese to oppose the entry of the Spanish troops into Italy. On the death of Antonio Farnese, Duke of Parma, January 10th, 1731, he took military possession of that State, and his agents persuaded the Duke's widow to declare herself pregnant, in order to prolong this occupation. The versatility of the Cabinets of that age, however, enabled the Emperor to attain his favourite object at a moment when he least expected it. The Queen of Spain, wearied with the slowness of Cardinal Fleury in carrying out the provisions of the Treaty of Seville, suddenly declared, in a fit of passion, that Spain was no longer bound by that treaty. Great Britain and the Dutch States, in concert with the Spanish Court, without the concurrence of France, now entered into negotiations with the Emperor, which were skilfully conducted by Lord Waldegrave, to induce him to accede to the Treaty of Seville; and, on March 16th, 1731, was concluded, what has been called the SECOND TREATY OF VIENNA.[3] Great Britain and the States guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction; and the Emperor, on his side, acceded to the provisions of Seville respecting the Italian Duchies, and agreed to annihilate the commerce of the Austrian Netherlands

[1] Dumont, t. viii. p. ii. 158. [2] *Ibid.* p. 160. [3] *Ibid.* p. 213.

with the Indies by abolishing the obnoxious Ostend Company. He also engaged not to bestow his daughter on a Bourbon Prince, or in any other way which might endanger the balance of power. The States of the Empire gave their sanction to the treaty in July, and Philip V. acceded to it before the end of that month. John Gaston de' Medicis, Grand Duke of Tuscany, finding himself thus abandoned by the Emperor, concluded with the Court of Spain what was called the *Family Convention*, and named Don Carlos his heir. Charles VI. at first manifested some displeasure at the Duke's thus disposing of his dominions like a family possession; but he was at length induced to authorize a decree of the Aulic Council, by which the guardianship of Don Carlos was assigned to the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duchess of Parma. In November an English squadron disembarked at Leghorn 6,000 Spaniards, who took possession of that place, as well as Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza, in the name of Don Carlos, as Duke of Parma and presumptive heir of Tuscany.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE incident which next disturbed the peace of Europe was what has been called the "War of the Polish Succession." The throne of Poland was rendered vacant by the death of Augustus II., February 1st, 1733.[1] It had been foreseen that on this event Louis XV. would endeavour to restore his father-in-law, Stanislaus Lesczinski, to the throne of Poland, a project which Austria and Russia had determined to oppose. With this view they selected, as a candidate for the Polish Crown, Emanuel, brother of John V., King of Portugal; and they engaged Frederick William I. of Prussia to support their designs by a treaty concluded December 31st, 1731, called the Treaty of Löwenwolde, from the name of the Russian minister who had the principal hand in its negotiation. The Duchy of Berg, the grand object of Frederick William's ambition, was to be assured to him, and Courland to a prince of the House of Brandenburg, upon the death of the last reigning Duke of the House of Kettler. This article, however, was unacceptable to the Court of St. Petersburg. The Empress, Anna Ivanowna,[2] wished to procure Courland for her favourite, Biron; she accordingly refused to ratify the treaty, and matters were in this state on the death of Augustus II.

When that event occurred, Frederick Augustus, the son and successor of Augustus II. in the Saxon Electorate, also became a candidate for the Polish Crown; and, in order to obtain it, he sought the assistance of the Emperor Charles VI., which he hoped to gain by adhering to the Pragmatic Sanction. In the previous year the Emperor had brought that matter before the German Diet, when a great majority of the States had ratified and guaranteed the Act (January 11th, 1732). The Electors of Bavaria and Saxony and the Palatine had, however, protested against it. The Elector of Bavaria and the son of the Elector of Saxony, the prince now in question, had married daughters of the Emperor

[1] It is said, from the effects of a drinking bout. *Mém. de Brandebourg*, t. iii. p. 70 (ed. 1758).

[2] We shall return to the history of Russia since the Peace of Nystädt.

Joseph I., whose eventual claims to the Austrian succession, as children of the elder brother, might be considered preferable to those of the daughters of Charles VI.; and, on July 4th, the two Electors had concluded, at Dresden, an alliance for the defence of their respective rights and prerogatives. But Charles VI. availed himself of the ambitious views of Frederick Augustus to obtain from him a renunciation of his pretensions; and the new Elector now solemnly acceded to the decree of the Empire regarding the Pragmatic Sanction, and agreed personally to guarantee it, the Emperor, in return, engaging to assist him to the Polish throne. In the treaty concluded between them, Charles VI. promised his unconditional aid in excluding Stanislaus, or any French candidate; while he undertook to afford Frederick Augustus every assistance for the attainment of his object that might be compatible with the constitution of the Polish Republic; but on condition that the Elector should consult the wishes of the Empress of Russia and King of Prussia. When he should have done this, Charles promised to furnish him with money to procure his election, and to support him in it with arms;[1] that is, first to corrupt, and then to constrain the Polish nobles. In consequence of this arrangement, a treaty was made in July, 1733, between the Elector of Saxony and the Empress of Russia, by which the agreement to elect a Prussian Prince to the Duchy of Courland was set aside; and it was agreed that when the anticipated vacancy should occur by the death of Duke Ferdinand, resort should be had to an *election;* doubtless, of much the same sort as was now to be accorded to the unhappy Poles. The Empress promised to support the election of Frederick Augustus in Poland not only by negotiation and money, but also by arms, "so far as could be done without violating the liberty of election;"[2] a clear impossibility. Thus the interests of the Portuguese Prince were entirely disregarded, who was, indeed, personally unacceptable to the Poles. After the withdrawal of this candidate, the King of Prussia would have preferred Stanislaus to the Elector of Saxony for King of Poland, as less dangerous to Prussian interests;[3] but he coquetted alternately with the French and Imperial Courts, and ended with doing nothing.

This conjuncture is principally important from the position now definitively taken up by Russia as a European Power. It had always been the policy of Peter the Great to nourish, under the

[1] The treaty only in Wenck, *Cod. Jur. Gent. rec.* t. i. p. 700.

[2] Rousset, *Recueil*, t. x. p. 1 sqq.

[3] *Mém. de Brandebourg*, t. iii. p. 71.

mask of friendship, the elements of discord existing in the Polish constitution, to make the weakness arising thence incurable, and thus to render Poland's escape from foreign influence impossible. It was only through the Czar that Augustus II. had been able to maintain himself on the throne. Russian troops almost continually occupied Poland, in spite of the remonstrances of the people, and Peter disposed as arbitrarily of the lives and estates of Polish subjects as if they had been a conquered people. Thus, for instance, when he was celebrating the marriage of his niece, Catharine, with the Duke of Mecklenburg at Dantzic in 1716, his fleet threatened that town in the very midst of the solemnities, and he compelled it to make a contribution of 150,000 dollars towards his war with Sweden. This was done under the very eyes of King Augustus, who was present in the town.[1] The Poles owed their misfortunes, as we have said, to their constitution, but also to their own faults and vices. Frederick II., speaking of Poland shortly after this time, says: "This kingdom is in a perpetual anarchy. All the great families are divided in their interests; they prefer their own advantage to the public good, and only unite for the cruel oppression of their subjects, whom they treat more like beasts of burden than men. The Poles are vain, overbearing in prosperity, abject in adversity; capable of any act in order to obtain money, which they throw out of window immediately they have got it; frivolous, without judgment, equally ready to take up or abandon a cause without any reason. They have laws, but nobody observes them, because there is no executive justice. When many offices become vacant, the power of the King increases in proportion, since he has the privilege to dispose of them; but the only return he meets with is ingratitude. The Diet assembles every three years, either at Grodno or Warsaw; when it is the policy of the Court to procure the election of a person devoted to it as Marshal of the Diet. Yet, during the whole reign of Augustus II. there was but one Diet which lasted. This cannot be otherwise, since a single deputy can interrupt their deliberations. It is the *Veto* of the ancient tribunes of Rome. . . . The women conduct political intrigues and dispose of everything, while their husbands get drunk. . . . Poland maintains an army of 24,000 men, but they are bad troops. In case of need it can assemble its *arrière-ban;* but Augustus II. in vain invoked it against Charles XII. Hence it was easy for Russia, under a more perfect government, to profit by the weakness of its neighbour, and to gain an ascendant over it."[2]

[1] Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. iv. S. 342. [2] *Mém. de Brandebourg*, ap. Garden.

France also employed money to secure the election of Stanislaus; but in fact, as a native Pole, he was the popular candidate, as well as by his personal qualities; and, had the nation been left to itself, and that liberty of election allowed to it which the Eastern Powers pretended to secure, he would have been the undisputed King of Poland. But as Austrian troops were massed in Silesia, while a Russian army was invading Poland from the east, it was necessary for Stanislaus to enter the Kingdom by stealth, in order to present himself to the electors. Had Cardinal Fleury, the French Minister, been more active, this necessity might have been averted; but he kept Stanislaus several months in France, and to insure his safety it became necessary to resort to an artifice. A person simulating Stanislaus was sent to Dantzic with a small French squadron having 1,500 troops on board; while the real Stanislaus proceeded to Warsaw by way of Berlin, in the disguise of a merchant. He was a second time elected King of Poland on the plain of Vola by a great majority of the electors—60,000 it is said; and his election was duly proclaimed by the Primate of the Kingdom, Theodore Potocki, September 12th, 1733. Some 3,000 of the Palatines, however, gained by the Elector of Saxony, and having the Bishop of Cracow at their head, quitted the field of election, crossed the Vistula to Praga, and elected Frederick Augustus, who, being supported by the Russian army, was proclaimed King of Poland, with the title of Augustus III. (October 5th), and was immediately recognized by the Emperor Charles VI.

Louis XV. made some vain remonstrances to the Cabinet of Vienna. He told them that his personal dignity would not permit him to abandon Stanislaus, about which they probably did not much care; as neither he nor the Poles who had elected Stanislaus took any pains to maintain him in his Kingdom. The junction of the Russian and Saxon troops compelled Stanislaus to fly from Warsaw, and take refuge at Dantzic, where he was besieged by the Russians. That place, after a brave and obstinate defence, was at length compelled to surrender, June 28th, 1734. Stanislaus had previously escaped in the disguise of a peasant to Marienwerder, and thence to Königsberg, where the King of Prussia afforded him protection. Thus Frederick William seemed to play an equivocal part; for while he sheltered Stanislaus, he sent 10,000 men to join the Imperial army which was to fight against his cause, but did nothing but rob and oppress the people among whom it was quartered. The Crown Prince, afterwards

Frederick the Great, accompanied these troops, and is said to have acquired some useful knowledge, by observing the bad discipline of the Austrians. All that the French did in favour of Stanislaus was to send a paltry expedition, consisting of three battalions, to Dantzic, which landed on May 10th and re-embarked on the 14th. These troops, on their return, touched at Copenhagen. Count Plélo, who was then French Ambassador in that city, was so indignant at their conduct that he led them back to Dantzic; but only to his own destruction and that of the greater part of his companions.[1] This was the first encounter between the Russians and French. After these events, the Russians and Austrians began to dictate in Poland, and the seat of government seemed to lie rather at St. Petersburg than Warsaw.[2] Some of the chief Polish nobles became Russian pensioners, and abused their paymasters while they pocketed their money.

The French Court seemed more intent on what advantage they might reap from the conjuncture than on supporting Stanislaus and the "dignity" of his son-in-law, Louis XV., or maintaining the balance of power. This last motive was indeed assigned in a secret treaty concluded between France and Sardinia, September 26th, 1733, for the purpose of an attack upon the Emperor's Italian provinces. The balance of power seemed rather to depend on the fate of Poland. Russia, however, notwithstanding her recent gigantic advances, does not yet appear to have inspired much alarm in Europe; at all events, France could promise herself but little benefit from a war with that country. The Sardinian sceptre had now passed to Charles Emanuel III., through the abdication of his father, Victor Amadeus II., in 1730. It was the custom of the House of Savoy to make peace or war according to its political convenience; and in the secret treaty with the French Crown it was agreed that the Milanese should be attacked, and, when conquered, annexed to the Sardinian dominions. By a particular convention, when the King of Sardinia should also acquire Mantua, Savoy was to be ceded to France.[3] The Austrian Netherlands were not to be attacked, unless the conduct of the Powers interested in their preservation rendered it necessary. So also the *Empire* was to be distinguished from the *Emperor*. Nothing was to be done to the

[1] *Mém. de Brandebourg*, t. iii. p. 72.

[2] See the state-paper drawn up for the instruction of Augustus III. ap. Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. iv. S. 559 ff.

[3] Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xv. p. 182. This, however, was a particular convention, and does not appear in the treaty, which is given by Garden, t. iii. p. 173 sqq.

prejudice of the former; and the King of Sardinia, when in possession of the Milanese, was to acknowledge that he held it as an Imperial fief. These arrangements were intended to prevent Holland and England from interfering on the ground of the Barrier Treaty, and to bring some of the German princes into the alliance. Further, by separate articles, it was agreed that it would be advisable to drive the Emperor from Naples and Sicily and the Tuscan ports; that is, to expel him entirely from Italy, when his Italian possessions were to be made over to Don Carlos and his heirs male, or, in their default, to the next sons of the Queen of Spain, and their male descendants, in the order of primogeniture; and, failing all male heirs, they were to be reunited to the Spanish Crown. The King of Spain was to be invited to accede to the treaty.

In consequence of this treaty, Louis XV. declared war against the Emperor, October 10th, 1733. The Queen of Spain seized the occasion to push the interest of her family. She longed to see Don Carlos on the throne of Naples; and her pride was hurt by the ancient forms of vassalage which bound him, as Duke of Parma and Tuscany, to the Emperor; as if these forms had been invented for the express purpose of humiliating an Infant of Spain! She had also another son to provide for. By the skilful administration of Patiño, called the Colbert of Spain, the army and navy had been brought into a flourishing condition; the former numbered 80,000 men, flushed with recent victories over the Moors in Africa. As soon as a rupture between France and Austria was certain, a defensive alliance was concluded at the Escorial, October 25th, between France, Spain, and Sardinia, according to the terms already mentioned. The Emperor endeavoured to draw England and Holland on his side; but these Powers determined to remain neutral, provided France abstained from attacking the Austrian Netherlands. The English Ministry, embarrassed by domestic affairs, and engrossed by the prospect of a general election, contented themselves with offering their mediation,[1] and, on November 24th, 1733, a convention was signed at the Hague, by which Louis XV. engaged not to invade the Netherlands.[2]

France began the war by seizing Lorraine, whose Duke, Francis Stephen, was destined to marry the Archduchess, Maria Theresa, and thus to become the stem of a new House of Austria. Marshal

[1] Coxe's *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole*, ch. xliii.
[2] Rousset, *Recueil*, t. ix. p. 461.

Berwick crossed the Rhine and captured Kehl, October 9th, 1733; but as this fortress belonged to the Empire, Louis, in order not to embroil himself with that body, declared that he would restore it at the peace. The conquest of the Milanese was intrusted to Marshal Villars, and, with the aid of the Piedmontese, was virtually effected in three months. Mantua, however, the stronghold of Lombardy, remained in possession of the Austrians, who were assembling in large masses in Tyrol. Villars besought Don Carlos and the Duke of Montemar, who had arrived in Italy with a Spanish army, to assist him in dispersing the Austrians; but they preferred marching to Naples, and in February, 1734, quitted North Italy. The German Diet, by a decree of February 26th, declared that France had violated the Peace of Baden by invading the Empire and the Duchy of Milan, as well as by levying contributions in the Circles; but the Electors of Bavaria, Cologne, and the Palatine remonstrated against this declaration, and determined to preserve a strict neutrality. In the campaign of this year, Berwick detached Count Bellisle against Trèves and Trarbach, which he took, while Berwick himself, with the main body, undertook the siege of Philippsburg, where he was killed in the trenches, June 12th. The command now devolved on Marshal d'Asfeld, to whom the place surrendered, July 18th. The Imperial army, under the command of the aged Eugene, now only the shadow of his former self, looked idly on during the siege. In Italy, the principal theatre of the war, the allies were everywhere successful. The conquest of the Milanese was completed by the capture of Novara and Tortona. The Imperialists, worsted near Parma, June 29th, gained indeed some advantage over Marshal Broglie, near Quistello, but were completely defeated September 19th, between Guastalla and Suzzara. Yet the King of Sardinia, who had displayed great courage in the battle, refused to follow up the victory. The joy of these successes was damped by the death of Villars at Turin, June 17th, within a few days of that of Berwick. They were the last of those great commanders who had illustrated the reign of Louis XIV.

The affairs of the Emperor went still worse in Southern Italy. Don Carlos and Montemar entered the Neapolitan dominions in May, 1734, and marched without resistance to the capital, which immediately opened its gates; for the Austrian sway was highly unpopular. Instead of meeting the enemy in the open field, the Emperor's forces had been weakened by being distributed into garrisons; the only considerable body of them which had been

kept together consisted of 9,000 or 10,000 men, entrenched at Bitonto, in Apulia, who were completely defeated by the Spaniards, May 25th. This victory decided the conquest of all Naples. Montemar then passed into Sicily and speedily reduced the whole of that island. Don Carlos was crowned King of the Two Sicilies at Palermo, July 3rd, 1735, with the title of Charles III. He was an amiable Prince, and, under the guidance of his enlightened minister, Bernardo Tanucci, an ancient professor of jurisprudence at Pisa, the reign of the Spanish Bourbons in Italy began with a promise which was not subsequently realized.

In Northern Italy, the campaign of 1735 was as favourable to the allies as that of the preceding year. The Imperialists were driven out of Austrian Lombardy, with the exception of Mantua, and even this they preserved only through the dissensions of the allies. As Spain claimed Mantua for Don Carlos, and would give Charles Emanuel no guarantee for the possession of the Milanese, that Prince was unwilling to forward the reduction of Mantua. France also, satisfied with the possession of Lorraine, did not wish Spain to reap any further advantages; and by refusing to supply battering artillery and by other means, endeavoured, in concert with the maritime Powers, to obstruct the progress of the Spanish arms.[1] Nothing memorable occurred on the Rhine. Marshal Coigny held Eugene in check, and prevented him from crossing that river, though he was supported by a corps of 10,000 Russians under Count Lacy and General Keith.

The appearance of this corps, however, hastened the negotiations between Austria and France, which had already been commenced. The reverses experienced by the Emperor led him to desire peace, while England and Holland offered to mediate. Their proposals were visibly in the Emperor's favour, and he seemed at first disposed to accept them. The proffered mediation was rejected, not by him, but by the allied Crowns; though Charles was indeed displeased with England and Holland, thinking that they had not afforded him that help which they were bound to give by the Second Treaty of Vienna. He listened, therefore, not unwillingly to the secret proposals of France, which were made to him at the instance of Chauvelin, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs; and preliminaries were signed at Vienna, October 3rd, 1735. France not only abandoned the cause of Stanislaus, the pretended object of the war, but also deserted Spain, whose subsidies she had received. A cessation of hostilities took place in

[1] *Correspondence of Lord Waldegrave*, ap. Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 271.

November, but the signature of a definite treaty was delayed more than three years through secret negotiations between the Cabinets of Vienna and Versailles, the subject of which is not certainly known, but probably related to the Pragmatic Sanction. The delay seems to have been caused by Cardinal Fleury listening to the representations of the Elector of Bavaria.

The Spanish Sovereigns were naturally indignant at the conduct of France; but the arming of the maritime Powers, and the appearance of an English squadron on the coasts of Spain, alarmed them into an acceptance of the peace (May, 1736).[1] By the THIRD TREATY OF VIENNA, November 18th, 1738, it was arranged that King Stanislaus should abdicate the Crown of Poland, but retain the Royal title. Augustus III. was to be recognized in his stead, while the Polish Constitution and liberty of election were guaranteed. Tuscany, on the death of the Grand Duke, was to be assigned to the Duke of Lorraine, whose duchies of Bar and Lorraine were to be transferred to Stanislaus;[2] the former immediately, the latter, so soon as the Duchy of Tuscany should become vacant. Stanislaus was to hold these duchies for life; and upon his decease they were to be united to the French Crown. The County of Falkenstein, however, a small district separated from Lorraine, and situated at the foot of Mount Tonnerre, was reserved to the Duke Francis Stephen, in order that he might hold a possession under the Empire, and that it might not be objected to him, when he should hereafter aspire to the Imperial Throne, as son-in-law of the Emperor Charles VI., that he was a foreign Prince. The Diet subsequently agreed that the vote which the Dukes of Lorraine had hitherto enjoyed in their quality of Marquises of Nomény should be attached to the County of Falkenstein. Naples and Sicily, with the Tuscan *præsidia*, were to remain in the possession of Don Carlos. The King of Sardinia to have the Novarese and Vigevanese, or the Tortonese and Vigevanese, or the Novarese and Tortonese, according to his option. Parma and Piacenza were to be assigned to the Emperor. France guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction, and acquiesced in the marriage of the Duke of Lorraine with the Archduchess, Maria Theresa[3]—a union which had hitherto been opposed by France, because Lorraine would thus have been ultimately added to the Austrian dominions. The King of Sardinia acceded to this treaty, February 3rd, 1739; and the Courts

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, iii. p. 277.

[2] It is to Stanislaus that Nanci owes those architectural pretensions which give it the air of a little capital.

[3] Wenck, *Cod. jur gent. rec.*, t. i. p. 86 and 88 sq.

of Madrid and Naples in the following April. Thus terminated a war for which the question of the Polish Succession afforded only a pretence.

The Emperor was the chief loser by this treaty; yet, though Naples and Sicily were wrested from his dominion, he recovered, on the other hand, nearly all the possessions which had been conquered from him in Northern Italy, besides acquiring Parma, and, indirectly, through his son-in-law, Tuscany. The recognition of the Pragmatic Sanction by France was also no slight advantage to him. The loss of Lorraine did not concern him directly, but merely in its quality of an Imperial fief; whilst, on the other hand, it was a direct and very important acquisition for France, and a very unlooked-for, though important, consequence of the ill-assorted marriage between Louis XV. and Mary Lesczinska. It was finally united to the French Crown on the death of Stanislaus, in 1766. England and Holland looked quietly on. The Spanish Sovereigns were highly discontented with the Treaty, though two kingdoms like Naples and Sicily were hardly a bad exchange for the two duchies of Parma and Tuscany. The Grand Duke of Tuscany, the last of the Medicis, died July 9th, 1737, worn out by debauchery; and thus, on the signature of the treaty, there was nothing to prevent the immediate execution of its provisions. Stanislaus had abdicated the Crown of Poland by an act signed at Königsberg, January 27th, 1736, and Russia signified her adherence to the provisions about Poland in May. The peace finally arranged at the Diet of Warsaw, July 10th, 1736, between Augustus III. and the Polish States, provided for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic religion, and the right of the Poles to elect their Sovereign. The Saxon troops were to leave the Kingdom in forty days, except the body-guard of the King, consisting of 1,200 men. The Russians were to evacuate the kingdom at the same time. Dissenters were to enjoy security of person and property; but they were not to be admissible into the public service, nor to the dignities of Palatines and Starosts; nor were they to be allowed to seek the protection of foreign Powers.[1]

One motive which had induced the Emperor to accede to the terms offered by France was the prospect of indemnifying himself for his losses by a war with the Turks, which he had entered into, in conformity with treaties, in conjunction with Russia.

[1] Schmauss, *Einleitung zu der Staatswissenschaft*, B. ii. S. 601 sq.

But to explain this matter it will be necessary to revert to the history of these countries since the Peace of Passarowitz.

Peter the Great had never digested his humiliation at the Pruth, nor abandoned his favourite schemes for extending his Empire; but, so long as he was engaged in the Northern War, nothing could be done. In contemplation of an expedition into Persia, which rendered peace with the Porte indispensable, he had renewed, in 1720, the treaties of the Pruth and Adrianople; and, in spite of the opposition of the English resident, Stanyan, he obtained two important concessions, viz., the privilege of having a resident minister at Constantinople, and the abrogation of the yearly present or tribute made to the Tatar Chan of the Crimea. It is remarkable that on this occasion both the contracting parties guaranteed the Polish Constitution, and declared that none of its territories or towns should be severed from Poland.[1] Hence, when the Russian troops entered that country in 1733 to support Augustus III., the Porte remonstrated against it as a breach of treaty; but being occupied with domestic dissensions, as well as with a Persian war, took no steps to prevent it.

It was the Czar's expedition into Persia, in 1722, which ultimately brought Russia into collision with the Turks. Persia was then in the throes of a revolution. The Throne of the Sefi Dynasty, which had reigned upwards of two centuries, was shaken by a revolt of the Afghans, and Hussein, the last of that Dynasty, was deposed by Mir Mahmood in 1722.[2] Peter complained of wrongs done to Russian merchants, and not being able to obtain the redress he demanded, declared war. In the summer of 1722 Peter embarked at Astrachan, and traversed the Caspian Sea, which he had previously caused to be surveyed, with a fleet carrying 22,000 soldiers. His real object was to obtain possession of Daghestan, and he captured and garrisoned Derbent, the capital of that province. He renewed the war in the following year, in spite of the remonstrances of the Porte, and made himself master of Ghilan and Bachu, while, on the other side, the Pasha of Erzerum broke into Georgia and seized Tiflis, the capital. A treaty with Turkey for the partition of Persia, and the restoration of some part of it to Shah Thamasp, Hussein's son, was one of the Czar's last political acts. He died of a urinary disorder, the con-

[1] Baemeister, *Beiträge zur Gesch. Peter des G.* B. iii. Beylage 21; Koch et Schöll, t. xiv. p. 298.

[2] The best account of the Persian Empire at this juncture, and of the character of Shah Hussein, will be found in Hanway's *Revolutions of Persia*, in his *Travels*, vol. ii.

sequence of his debauches, February 10th, 1725, in the fifty-second year of his age. A being of the wildest and most savage impulse, yet capable of deep reflection and indomitable perseverance; addicted to debauchery, and possessing unlimited means for its indulgence, yet submitting himself voluntarily, for the sake of his country, to all the hardships and privations of a common mechanic; bred up in what are perhaps the most obstinate of all prejudices, those of a half-civilized people, yet one of the most remarkable reformers of any age, and in the space of his short reign, the real founder of the Russian Empire.

Peter's son Alexis, by his first wife, Eudoxia, had died in 1718, in a mysterious manner. The conduct of Alexis had never been satisfactory to his father. He was averse to all military exercises, the slave of the priests, and the tool of the Old Russian Party, which hated and opposed all Peter's innovations and reforms. Hence, at an early period, the Czar had seriously meditated depriving him of the succession and shutting him up in a convent. Peter, during his absence in the war of 1711, had left his son nominal Regent; but was so little content with his conduct that, in a memorable letter addressed to the Senate, he directed them, in case of his own death, to elect "the worthiest" for his successor. His discontent with his heir went on increasing. During Peter's journey to Holland and France, in 1717, Alexis had fled for protection to the Court of Vienna. After a short stay in that capital, and afterwards in the fortress of Ehrenberg, in Tyrol, he proceeded under a false name to Naples, and found a refuge in the Castle of St. Elmo. His hiding-place was, however, discovered; the Viceroy gave him up on the demand of the Czar's envoys; and on February 3rd, 1718, he was brought back to Moscow. On the following morning he was arraigned before a great council of the clergy, nobles, and principal citizens of Moscow, in whose presence he was compelled to sign a solemn act of renunciation of the Crown. The confessions which Alexis made on this occasion led to the discovery of a plot which had been hatching seven years, and in which some of the leading Russian nobles were implicated. The objects of it were to massacre, after the accession of Alexis, all the chief Russians and Germans who had been employed in carrying out the reforms of Peter; to make peace with Sweden, and restore to that Power St. Petersburg and the other conquests which had been gained from it; to disband the standing army, and restore the soldiers to their original condition of peasants. On May 26th, 1718, a

large assembly of the clergy, and of the highest civil and military officers, found the Czarewitsch guilty on these charges, and pronounced sentence of death. This verdict was read to Alexis; and, according to the account of the matter most favourable to Peter, the fright occasioned by it produced an apoplexy of which the young Prince died on the following day. According to another account, he was subjected to the knout, his father administering some of the first blows with his own hand; the punishment was twice renewed on the same day, and on the third application he expired.[1]

Alexis had left two children: a daughter, Natalia Alexejewna, born July 23rd, 1714, and a son, Peter Alexejewitsch, born October 22nd, 1715. These were his offspring by his consort, a Princess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, whom he hated because she was a Protestant, and is said to have treated so ill as to cause her death after her second lying-in. According to the laws of hereditary succession, the son of Alexis, now nine years old, was entitled to the Crown on the death of the Czar. But by a ukase, published in February, 1722, before proceeding on his expedition into Persia, Peter had asserted his privilege to settle the succession of the Crown; and, in May, 1724, he had caused his wife Catharine to be solemnly crowned in the cathedral at Moscow—a ceremony which he intended as no vain and empty pageant, but as an indication and pledge that she was to succeed him in the Imperial dignity. He does not seem, however, to have made any formal nomination of her;[2] and after her coronation he appears to have discovered that she had been unfaithful to him with the chamberlain, Mons. Catharine's elevation to the throne was effected, partly through corruption, partly by force, by her partizans, the New Russian Party, in opposition to the Old Russian faction. The only evidence produced in favour of her claim to the Crown was Peter's verbal declaration that he would make her his successor. Nothing of much importance occurred during the two years of Catharine's reign. She died May 6th, 1727. Soon after her accession she had married her eldest daughter, Anna Petrowna, then seventeen years of age, to the Duke of Holstein.

When Catharine I. lay on her death-bed, an assembly of the

[1] Le Fort's *Relation*, ap. Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. iv. S. 330.

[2] There is a document called *The Political Testament of Peter the Great*, the authenticity of which has been much contested. It is, at all events, a remarkable piece. One of the articles insists on the necessity of approaching Constantinople and India, on the ground that "he who commands them is the true ruler of the world." Zinkeisen, *Gesch des osm. Reichs*, B. v. S. 607 Anm.

great civil and military officers of the Empire determined that the Crown should be given to Peter, the son of Alexis. This grandson of Peter the Great was now in his twelfth year, and the assembly fixed his majority at sixteen. During his minority the Government was to be conducted by the Supreme Council, under the presidency of the Duchess of Holstein and the Princess Elizabeth, second daughter of Peter and Catharine. This arrangement, however, was somewhat modified by a pretended will of Catharine's, which appears to have been manufactured by Prince Menschikoff and Count Bassewitz, and bore the signature of the Princess Elizabeth, who was accustomed to sign all documents for the Empress. It contained not, like the resolutions of the Assembly, any indemnity for the judges who had condemned Alexis. The decision of the Supreme Council was to be governed by the majority, and the Czar was to be present at their deliberations, but without a voice. The Government was to effect the marriage of the Czar with a daughter of Prince Menschikoff's. Should Peter II. die without heirs, he was to be succeeded, first, by the Duchess of Holstein and her descendants, and then by her sister, the Princess Elizabeth, and her descendants. Failing heirs of all these, the Crown was to go to Natalia, daughter of Alexis.[1]

In spite of these regulations, however, Menschikoff, who was so ignorant that he could hardly read or write, virtually seized the Regency, and exercised a despotism even more terrible than that of Peter the Great. He was immediately made Generalissimo, and betrothed the Czar to his eldest daughter, Maria. The only other member of the Council who enjoyed any share in the Government was Baron Ostermann, the Vice-Chancellor. The Duke and Duchess of Holstein lost all influence, and to avoid Menschikoff's insolence, proceeded to Holstein, where the Duchess died in the following year, a few months after giving birth to a son, who, in course of time, became Peter III. But the overbearing conduct, the avarice and corruption of Menschikoff became in a few months so intolerable, that the youthful Czar summoned courage to banish him to Siberia (September, 1727), where he died two years afterwards. Ostermann continued to retain his influence, and a struggle for power took place between the Golowkins, the Dolgoroukis, and the Golizyns. Peter the Great's first wife, Eudoxia, had returned to Moscow after the accession of her grandson, but she obtained no influence. There is nothing memorable to be recorded during the reign of Peter II., whose only passion was an extravagant

[1] Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. iv. S. 497 u. Anm.

fondness for the chase. He died of the small-pox in January, 1730, just as he was on the point of being married to the Princess Catharine Dolgorouki. His sister, Natalia, had preceded him to the tomb. The Russian nobles now selected Peter the Great's niece, Anna Ivanovna, the widowed Duchess of Courland, to succeed to the throne, but on condition that she should sign a capitulation by which she engaged not to marry, nor to name a successor, besides many other articles which could have rendered her only an instrument in the hands of the Dolgoroukis and their party. But soon after her accession, with the assistance of the nobles who were opposed to that party, she cancelled this capitulation, and sent the Dolgoroukis into banishment. Baron Ostermann became the chief counsellor of the Empress Anna; but she was principally ruled by her favourite, Biron, the son of an equerry.

Under the reign of this Empress, the schemes of Peter the Great against the Ottoman Empire were revived. In consequence of the restoration of Azof and Taganrog to the Porte, and the destruction of the Russian forts, the Crim and Nogay Tatars had again become troublesome, and made incursions into the Russian territories; while disputes had also been going on respecting boundary lines on the Caspian and Black Seas and in the Ukraine. The Persian conquests of Peter the Great were, however, almost entirely abandoned. Besides the enormous sums required for their defence, these provinces were found to be but the grave of brave officers and soldiers. A treaty was, therefore, concluded in January, 1732, between the Empress Anna and the celebrated Taehmas Kouli Khan, by which a great part of the Russian conquests in Persia was restored.[1] On the other hand, it was resolved to recover Azof and to chastize the Tatars; but this object was retarded a while by the Russian interference in the affairs of Poland, already recorded.

Turkey was now exhausted by her long war with Persia, as well as by the revolution which had taken place at Constantinople, and the consequent efforts of the Government to extirpate the Janissaries. These troops, alienated by the heavy taxes and the dearness of provisions, and more especially by the reluctance displayed by Sultan Achmet III. to prosecute a projected expedition against Persia, had, in September, 1730, organized a revolt, under the conduct of an Albanian named Patrona Chalil, one of their body,

[1] Rousset, *Recueil*, t. vii. p. 457. Taehmas obtained the Persian throne, with the title of Nadir Shah, in 1736. One of his first acts was to unite the sects of the Shütes and Sonnites, and to make peace with the Turks. Hanway, ii. p. 343.

and a dealer in old clothes; who, having spent his money in fitting himself out for the war, was vexed to be disappointed of his expected booty. Weak, luxurious, and good-tempered, Achmet negotiated with the rebels, and delayed till it was too late to strike a decisive blow. The rebels seemed to receive his proposals favourably; they wished him all prosperity, but required satisfaction of their demands and the surrender of those persons to whom they imputed the public distress, including the Mufti, the Grand Vizier, Ibrahim, the Sultan's sons-in-law, and others. Finding that nobody would fight in his cause, Achmet caused the persons demanded to be strangled, and delivered to the Janissaries. But even this would not satisfy them. They had stipulated that their victims should be surrendered alive, and they pretended that the bodies of some slaves had been substituted for those of the persons they had demanded. Achmet was now compelled to abdicate in favour of his nephew, Mahmood, son of Mustapha II. Nevertheless, Patrona Chalil continued several weeks to be the real Sovereign of Turkey. At first he affected the purest disinterestedness. He caused the treasures of the Grand Vizier and other victims to be fairly divided among his confederates, and he demanded the abolition of all the new taxes. But having incurred the suspicion of accepting bribes, he lost the confidence of his associates, and the Government was enabled to effect his destruction. Patrona was admitted to attend the sittings of the Divan; and on one of these occasions, he and two other of the principal ringleaders were put to death in the midst of the assembled ministers. After this, with the assistance of the citizens, the revolt was gradually extinguished.

The war with Persia, however, still went on. In 1733 and 1734 the Osmanlis made two most unsuccessful campaigns against that country, so that they confessed themselves "that they were never more embarrassed since the establishment of their monarchy."[1] The fate of the Turkish Empire had already become an object of solicitude to the statesmen of Europe. It was remarked that the Osmanli Dominion was supported, not by its own intrinsic power, but through the jealousy of Christian princes, who did not wish to see the States of others aggrandized by the partition of its provinces. It was at this time that Cardinal Alberoni amused his leisure hours by drawing up a scheme for the annihilation of Turkey as an independent Power, which is worth mentioning here only as a proof of the interest excited by the fate of Turkey among

[1] Hanway, vol. ii. p. 333.

the politicians of that day.[1] It does not appear, however, that any jealousy then existed of Russia aggrandizing herself at the expense of Turkey.

The French, opposed to Russia in the affairs of Poland, were seeking to incite the Porte to a war with that country through their resident Villeneuve and the renegade Count Bonneval, who had turned Mahometan, and become Pasha of Bosnia.[2] England and Holland, on the contrary, endeavoured to maintain the peace. These Powers desired not the ruin of the Turks, who were their best customers for cloths and other articles; nor did they wish to see a Russian commerce established in the Mediterranean through the Black Sea, which could not but be injurious to their trade.[3]

The pretence seized by the Russians for declaring war against the Porte was the passing of the Tatars through their territories when marching to the war in Persia. Field-Marshal Münnich was appointed to command the army destined to operate against the Crimea and Azof. The first expedition took place in 1735, when the Russians penetrated into the Steppes, but were compelled to return with great loss. In the following year Münnich captured Perekop, forced the lines which protected the Crimea, and overran that peninsula, but was compelled to evacuate it again in the autumn. In the same campaign, Azof surrendered to Field-Marshal Lacy (July 1st). The operations of 1737 were directed more against the proper dominions of Turkey. Otschakow was taken, and Münnich entered the Ukraine.

Meanwhile the Emperor Charles VI. had also begun to take part in the war, from causes which demand a few words of explanation.

The relations between Austria and the Porte had not been essentially disturbed since the Peace of Passarowitz; though Bonneval, who thought that he had been injured by Austria, and who had leagued himself with the Transylvanian Prince, Joseph Ragoczy, son of Francis Ragoczy, used every endeavour to incite the Porte to an Austrian war. But, on the other hand, Russia claimed the assistance of Austria, under an alliance which had been concluded between them in 1726, the occasion of which was as

[1] Alberoni's plan was published at Frankfort and Leipsic in 1736.

[2] The *Mémoires du Comte de Bonneval* contain his extraordinary adventures, in which, however, there is a good deal of fiction.

[3] See Münnich, *Tagebuch über den ersten Feldzug des in den Jahren* 1735 *bis* 1739 *geführten russisch-türkischen Kriegs* (Hermann, *Beyträge zur Gesch. des Russ. Reiches*). This journal is the best authority for the ensuing war.

follows. The Empress Catharine had, in 1725, demanded from Denmark the freedom of the Sound, and the restitution of Schleswick to the Duke of Holstein, and seemed preparing to enforce these demands by a war. The King of Denmark hereupon appealed to George I. for help, according to the treaties existing between them; and early in 1726 a large English fleet, under the command of Admiral Wager, appeared in the Baltic. As it was suspected that the real design of the Russian Court was rather to support the partisans of the Duke of Holstein in Sweden than to invade Denmark, Admiral Wager informed King Frederick that he came to maintain peace in the North, and to protect Sweden against the enterprises of Russia. The Russian fleet did not venture to leave port. Catharine I., incensed by this conduct, joined the Alliance of Vienna by the Treaty of August 6th, 1726, already mentioned (*supra*, p. 58). It was under this treaty, by which Austria and Russia, besides guaranteeing each other's possessions, had agreed in case of war to assist one another with 30,000 men, that Russia demanded the aid of Austria in her war with the Turks. The latter Power sent the stipulated quota into Hungary as a corps of observation, and, in January, 1737, the treaty of 1726 was renewed. Austria undertook to furnish 50,000 men; with the aid of the Empire an army of 120,000 men was ultimately raised, and placed under the command of Count von Seckendorf, with whom the young Duke Francis Stephen of Lorraine, son-in-law of the Emperor, was nominally associated as commander-in-chief.

War was publicly declared against the Turks, July 14th, after a solemn service in St. Stephen's Church at Vienna. It was ordered that the Turks' bell should be rung every morning at seven o'clock throughout the Empire, when all were to offer up their prayers for the success of the Christian cause. The Austrian arms were at first successful. Nissa capitulated June 23rd, and another division subdued Possega and Kassova. But the fortune of the Imperialists now began to change. Seckendorf had divided his forces too much; an attempt on Widdin entirely failed, and in October the Turks recovered Nissa. Seckendorf, who was a Protestant, was now recalled, subjected to a court-martial and imprisoned, and Field-Marshal Philippi was appointed to succeed him.

The campaign of 1738 was unfavourable both to the Russians and Austrians. The Russians again invaded the Crimea with the design of taking Kaffa, but without success, and Münnich's campaign of the Dniester was equally fruitless. The Imperialists, under Counts Wallis and Neuperg, defeated the Turks at Kronia, near

Mehadia, but with great loss on their part; while the Turks soon after took Semendria, Mehadia, Orsova, and Fort St. Elizabeth; when the Imperial army withdrew behind the walls of Semlin and Belgrade. The unsatisfactory issue of this campaign, both for Russia and Austria, produced a coolness between those Powers. The Cabinet of Vienna complained that Münnich had not carried out the plan agreed upon by attacking Bender and Chóczim; also that he had hindered a Russian corps of 30,000 men from joining the Imperial army in Hungary. Both Powers now began to meditate a separate peace, and Sweden and Prussia offered their mediation. The events of 1739, however, gave a new turn to affairs. Münnich crossed the Dniester, stormed and took the Turkish camp at Stawutschane (August 28th), and captured Choczim. Then passing the Pruth, he entered Jassy, while the Bojars of Moldavia signified their submission. His intention now was to march on Bender, and in the following year to penetrate into the heart of the Grand Signor's dominions, when he was arrested by the unwelcome news that a peace had been concluded at Belgrade.

The fortune of the Austrians this year had been as ill as his own was good. On July 23rd, they had been totally defeated at Grozka with a loss of more than 20,000 men, and had abandoned the field in panic flight. The Turks, who compared their victory to that of Mohács, now laid siege to Belgrade. The Imperial Cabinet saw no hope of safety except in making a peace by submitting to some losses, and Neuperg was commissioned to treat. The Empress of Russia, against the advice of Ostermann, and at the instigation of her favourite, Biron,[1] now Duke of Courland, accepted, in conjunction with Austria, the mediation of France, through Villeneuve, the French ambassador at the Porte. This step is attributed to Biron's envy of Münnich, and fear of the Old Russian Party, which was again raising its head, and necessitated peace abroad. On September 1st, 1739, Neuperg signed preliminaries in the Turkish camp, by which he engaged to surrender Belgrade and Schabatz, to evacuate Servia, Austrian Wallachia, and Orsova, and to raze Mehadia as well as the new works at Belgrade. These preliminaries were guaranteed by France. Villeneuve, it is said, had had the less difficulty to persuade Neuperg to surrender Belgrade, because he knew the Duke of Lorraine and Maria Theresa

[1] Ferdinand, Duke of Courland, the last of the House of Kettler, having died May 4, 1737, Biron was elected under Russian influence and bayonets, and was recognized by Augustus III. and the Polish Senate in 1739.

wished for peace at any price, lest, at the anticipated death of the Emperor, and through the troubles which were likely to ensue thereon, they should be hampered by this war.[1] The Austrian Cabinet repented when it heard of Münnich's victory at Choczim, but did not withhold its ratification of the definitive treaty, which was signed September 18th. By the peace concluded between the Porte and Russia on the same day, Azof was assigned to the Russians; but the fortifications were to be razed and the country around it wasted, in order to serve as a boundary between the two nations. Russia was authorized to build fortresses on the Don, and the Porte to do the same on the borders of the Kuban. The fortifications of Taganrog were not to be restored. Russia was to maintain no fleet either on the Sea of Zabach (or Azof) or on the Black Sea, and her commerce was to be carried on only in Turkish vessels.[2] Münnich, irritated at this peace, in contravention of orders from the Russian Court, continued the war a little while, and cantoned his troops in Poland and Moldavia; and it was only on a repetition of the command to withdraw that he at length retired into the Ukraine.

[1] This, however, is denied by Mailath (*Gesch. v. Oestreich*, B. iv. S. 643), who alleges that Neuperg's son, in a biography published in justification of his father, ignores this story, which would have formed a plausible excuse. Both Neuperg and Wallis, the Austrian commander with whom he acted, were thrown into prison by the Emperor, but released soon after his death.

[2] Laugier, *Negociations for the Peace of Belgrade*, ch. xviii. sqq. (Engl. Trans.).

CHAPTER XLV.

THE next epoch, of which we shall treat in the two following chapters, extending from the third Treaty of Vienna, in 1738, to the Peace of Aix la Chapelle in 1748, is marked by two wars; a maritime war between England and Spain, and the war of the Austrian Succession. The complicated relations which arose out of the latter soon caused these two wars to run into one; or rather, perhaps, the interest inspired by that of the Austrian Succession caused the other to be forgotten.

Under the reign of Charles II. of Spain, the English merchants had been allowed considerable privileges in their trade with the Spanish colonies in America. The ministers of that King having need of the friendship of Great Britain, had winked at the contraband trade carried on by the English, and had exercised the right of search indulgently. But all this was altered after the accession of Philip V. We have seen that at the Peace of Utrecht the privilege of supplying the Spanish possessions with slaves was assigned to the English by the *Asiento* for thirty years, besides the right of sending an annual ship to the fair of Vera Cruz. There can be no doubt that these privileges were abused by the English merchants; while, on the other hand, useless difficulties were thrown in the way even of the legitimate trade by the Spaniards, and illegal seizures were frequently made by their *guarda costas*, or cruisers. Hence demands for redress on the part of the English, and counter-claims on the part of Philip V., on account of his reserved share of the profits of the *Asiento*, and for duties evaded. Horrible stories were told on both sides of barbarities committed; the tale of "Jenkins' ears" will be familiar to all readers of English history.[1] Disputes also arose respecting the boundaries of Carolina and Florida, and the feeling against Spain ran so high in England that the peaceful Sir Robert Walpole was at length reluctantly compelled to make some hostile demonstrations.

[1] See Coxe, *Memoirs of Sir R. Walpole*, ch. li.

The conjuncture was more important than, at first sight, it might appear to be. It was far from merely involving some commercial questions between England and Spain. It was nothing less than the commencement of a struggle between the Anglo-Saxon race and the nations of Roman descent to obtain a predominance in the colonies, and the principal share of the commerce of the world. The Bourbon Courts of France and Spain had again approached each other and formed a league against the maritime and colonial power of Great Britain. In November, 1733, Philip V. and Louis XV. had concluded, at the Escorial, a family compact, in which Philip declared his intention of depriving the English of their commercial privileges; while Louis promised to support him in that purpose by maintaining a fleet at Brest, and equipping as many privateers as possible. Articles in favour of French maritime commerce were agreed upon, and Louis engaged to procure the restoration of Gibraltar to Spain, even by resorting, if necessary, to force.[1] In pursuance of this treaty, the French, after the close of the war of the Polish Succession, in 1735, devoted great attention to their navy; and the Count de Maurepas, who was to pursue the same policy forty years later with more success, made preparations for building in the ports of Toulon and Brest twenty-six ships of the line and thirty of an inferior class. Spain also had been actively employed at Ferrol and Cadiz.

The English nation, or more properly, perhaps, the commercial portion of it, had thus taken a juster view of its interests than the ministry. The warlike demonstrations made by Walpole extorted from the Spanish Cabinet the "Convention of the Pardo," January 14th, 1739. The King of Spain engaged to pay 95,000*l.* in satisfaction of the damages claimed by English merchants; but, on the other hand, he demanded from the South Sea Company, which traded under the *Asiento,* 68,000*l.* for his share of the profits of the trade, and for duties on negroes imported. If this sum were not shortly paid, he reserved the right to suspend the *Asiento,* and he declared that the Convention entered into was not valid except subject to this declaration. Walpole endeavoured to persuade the English Parliament to accept these terms, but the nation would not listen to them; and the popular discontent ran so high that he found himself compelled to make preparations for war. A treaty of subsidies was concluded with Denmark,

[1] Treaty in Cantillo, Tratados de Paz, ap. Ranke, *Preuss. Gesch.* B. ii. S. 179. Ranke is of opinion that had Lord Mahon (*Hist. of England*, ch. xx.) and Mr. Bancroft (*Hist. of America*, ch. xxiv.) been acquainted with the contents of this treaty, they would have modified their judgment respecting the objects of the war.

March 25th, by which that Power engaged to keep on foot an army of 6,000 men, for three years, at the rate of thirty crowns for each foot-soldier, and forty-five crowns for each horse-soldier, besides an annual subsidy of 250,000 crowns. A British fleet was sent to Gibraltar—a proceeding which greatly irritated the Spaniards. Philip V. complained of it as an insult, and announced to Mr. Keene, the British Minister at Madrid, his determination to revoke the *Asiento*, and to seize the effects of the South Sea Company in satisfaction of his demands. This declaration brought matters to a crisis. The English Government demanded the immediate execution of the Convention of the Pardo, the acknowledgment of the British claims in Georgia and Carolina, and the unequivocal renunciation of the rights of search. Spain replied by a manifesto and declaration of war, which was followed by another on the part of England, November 9th. Letters of reprisal had been previously issued, by which, at the outset, the English appear to have been the greatest sufferers. During the first three months of the war the Spanish privateers made forty-seven prizes, valued at 234,000*l*.[1] All English merchandise was prohibited in Spain on the penalty of death, so that many neutral vessels arriving at Cadiz could not discharge their cargoes. Meanwhile Admiral Vernon, setting sail with the English fleet from Jamaica, captured Porto Bello, on the Isthmus of Darien, December 1st—an exploit for which he received the thanks of both Houses of Parliament. His attempt on Carthagena, in the spring of 1741, proved, however, a complete failure through his dissensions, it is said, with General Wentworth, the commander of the land forces. A squadron, under Commodore Anson, despatched to the South Sea for the purpose of annoying the Spanish colonies of Peru and Chili, destroyed the Peruvian town of Paita, and made several prizes; the most important of which was one of the great Spanish galleons trading between Acapulco and Manilla, having a large treasure on board. It was on this occasion that Anson circumnavigated the globe, having sailed from England in 1740, and returned to Spithead in 1744.[2] Meanwhile France, at the demand of Spain, had begun to arm and equip her fleets, though protesting her pacific intentions.

Scarcely had the war broken out between England and Spain, when the Emperor Charles VI. died, October 20th, 1740, soon after completing his fifty-fifth year. He was the last male of the

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 313.

[2] See Anson's *Voyage round the World*, by Walter.

House of Habsburg, which had filled the Imperial throne during three centuries without interruption. His eldest daughter, Maria Theresa, had been appointed heir to the Austrian dominions by the Pragmatic Sanction, which instrument, as we have seen, had been guaranteed by most of the European Powers, and she assumed the government with the title of Queen of Hungary and Bohemia. Maria Theresa was now in her twenty-fourth year, a handsome lady, of winning manners. She had married, in 1736, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Francis of Lorraine, the man of her choice, by whom she already had a son and heir, the Archduke Joseph. Charles VI., in the forlorn hope that he might still have male issue, had neglected to procure the Roman Crown for his son-in-law, and the Imperial dignity consequently remained in abeyance till a new Emperor should be elected. After Charles's death, therefore, the Austrian dominions figured only as one among the numerous German States, and even with less consideration than might be due to their extent, from the circumstance that Maria Theresa's pretensions to inherit them might soon be called in question. Eugene had counselled Charles to have in readiness 200,000 men, as a better security for his daughter's succession than any parchment sanctions; but the Emperor had left the army in a bad state, while the finances were exhausted by the late wars, and by his love for magnificence and art. The abuse of the Imperial revenue had been enormous. One of the Queen's first cares was to put a stop to this extravagance. Many superfluous servants, male and female singers, painters, sculptors, architects, and other artists, who were in receipt of high salaries, were either dismissed or their emoluments were reduced, and a shameful system of peculation was abolished.[1]

The announcement of Maria Theresa's accession was answered by England, Russia, Prussia, and the Dutch States with assurances of friendship and good will. France returned an evasive answer; the Elector Charles Albert of Bavaria refused to acknowledge the Queen of Hungary before his pretensions to the Austrian Succession were examined and decided. These he founded not on his having married a daughter of Joseph I.—a claim which would have been barred not only by the renunciation

[1] The following articles may serve by way of specimen of these abuses. In the butler's reckoning, six quarts of wine were set down daily for each Court lady; for the widowed Empress Amelia, wife of Joseph I., twelve quarts of Hungarian wine every evening, as a *Schlaftrunk*, or sleeping potion; for the Emperor's parrots, every year, two pipes of Tokay, to soak their bread, and fifteen kilderkins of Austrian wine for their bath. In the kitchen 4,000 florins were set down yearly for parsley! *Gesch. und Thaten Maria Theresias*, ap. Menzel, B. v. S. 289 Anm.

of that Archduchess, but also by the superior title of her elder sister, the Queen of Poland. He appealed to two ancient instruments—the marriage contract between Albert V. Duke of Bavaria and Anne, daughter of the Emperor Ferdinand I., and to the testament of the same Monarch; and he contended that by these two deeds the Austrian succession was assured to Anne and her descendants in default of *male* heirs, the issue of the Archdukes, her brothers. Maria Theresa, however, having called together the foreign ministers at her Court, caused the testament to be laid before them; when it appeared that it spoke not of the extinction of the *male* issue of Ferdinand's sons, but of their *legitimate* issue.[1] In fact, it was intended only to secure the Archduchess Anne against the pretensions of the Spanish branch of the House of Habsburg, and, after the extinction of that branch, had no longer any meaning; for, if the female issue of the Habsburg family was to have claims to the Austrian Monarchy, the daughter of the last male was the natural heiress. The Bavarian ambassador, however, was not satisfied. He narrowly scrutinized the document, in hope of finding an erasure; and having failed in that search, he boldly contended that, according to the context, the expression "legitimate heirs" could mean only male heirs. But the indignation against him at Vienna having grown to a high pitch, he found it prudent quietly to leave the city. The dispute, however, between the two Courts was continued in voluminous, unreadable documents, now almost forgotten.[2]

The first blow struck against the Queen of Hungary came not, however, from any of the claimants of her inheritance, but from a monarch who had recognized her right. This was Frederick II., the young King of Prussia, who, in the middle of December, 1740, entered the Austrian province of Silesia with 30,000 men.

Frederick's father, Frederick William I. of Prussia, had died on May 31st, 1740, about five months before the Emperor Charles VI. This second King of the House of Hohenzollern disposed of the lives and property of his subjects as arbitrarily as any Oriental despot; yet, as the simplicity of his life offered a favourable contrast to the profligacy and luxury of many of the

[1] The documents are in Rousset, *Actes et Mém.* t. xiv. xv.

[2] Mailath, *Gesch. des östr. Kaiserstaats*, B. v. S. 2; cf. Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 290. The story, however, is not quite clear. Anne's marriage contract in 1546 is said to have varied from the will. See Ohlenschlager, *Gesch. des Interregnums*, B. i. S. 45-224; Stumpf, *Baierns polit. Gesch.*, ap. Stenzel, B. iv. S. 70 f. It is hardly possible, however, that Ferdinand should have contemplated a wilful fraud. He left three legitimate sons, and it must have been a matter of indifference to him whether, at a remote period, the Austrian dominions should be enjoyed by their female posterity or by that of his daughter Anne.

German Princes of that age, as he had a strong and determined will, and was, on the whole, so far as his ignorance, prejudices, and irascible temper would permit, a well-meaning man, he is still admired by a few Germans, and perhaps by one or two Englishmen. His very faults, however, served to prepare his son's greatness. His avarice and meanness had enabled him to leave a full treasury; his military tastes, yet unwarlike character, had prompted him to get together a large and well-appointed army, which, from his avoidance of war, descended undiminished to his son. It may even be suspected that his bigotry and narrow-mindedness were among the chief causes which, by virtue of their repulsiveness, produced the opposite qualities in Frederick. The natural temper, as well as defective education of Frederick-William, whose chief pleasure lay in muddling himself with tobacco-smoke and small German beer in his evening club, or "Tobacco College," led him to hate and despise all learning and accomplishments which aimed at something beyond the barely useful and necessary; and hence, in the plan which he chalked out for his son's education, he had expressly excluded the study of the Latin language, of Greek and Roman history, and many other subjects necessary to form, or recreate, a liberal mind. But the only effect of this prohibition on the active and inquiring mind of Frederick was to make him pursue the forbidden studies with tenfold ardour, and to give to the acquisition of them all the relish of a stolen enjoyment.[1] The conduct of Peter the Great and Frederick William I. towards their sons forms a striking parallel, though in an inverse sense. The harshness and brutality of both these Sovereigns caused their heirs apparent to fly; Alexis ultimately met his death from his father's hands, and Frederick only narrowly escaped the same fate. But Peter's hatred of his son sprang from the latter's desire to return to the old Russian barbarism; while that of the Prussian King was excited by Frederick's love of modern civilization and art. Frederick William's bigoted Calvinistic tenets, the long prayers which he inflicted on his household, the tedious catechizings which his son had to endure from Nolten and other divines, instead of inspiring Frederick with a love of religion, drove him to the opposite extreme; a natural turn for scepticism was heightened by disgust, and made him a disciple of Bayle and

[1] The family history of the Prussian Court, which cannot be entered into here, will be found amusingly narrated in Mr. Carlyle's *Frederick the Great*. See also the *Mémoires* of Frederick's sister, Wilhelmina, Margravine of Baireuth; Förster's *Friedrich Wilhelm*, B. i., &c.

Voltaire. Even the arbitrary and absolute principles of his father in matters of government and police found no sympathy, so far at least as speculation is concerned, in the breast of Frederick II. If Louis XIV. had his maxim, *L'état c'est moi*, Frederick William asserted with equal force, if not elegance, "Ich stabilire die *Souveraineté* wie einen *rocher* von Bronze."[1] His son, on the contrary, at all events in theory, considered a king to be only the servant of his people; and one of his first announcements, on ascending the throne, was that he had no interests distinct from those of his subjects. He immediately abolished all distinctions and civil disabilities founded on religion, and mitigated the rigour of the criminal law, which, under his father's reign, had been administered with great cruelty, not to say injustice.[2] He also abolished many of the barbarities practised under the name of military discipline, and in the recruiting service.

The care, however, which Frederick William had bestowed on the army proved of the greatest benefit to his successor and to the Prussian nation. The great Northern War, which had threatened to sweep Frederick William into its vortex at the commencement of his reign, the augmentation of the power of his neighbours by the accession of the Elector of Hanover to the throne of Great Britain, and of the Elector of Saxony to that of Poland, as well as the growth of Russia into a large military Power, had compelled him to keep up a considerable army. Under the care of Prince Leopold of Dessau, who had distinguished himself in the war of the Spanish Succession, the Prussian infantry were trained to the height of discipline. The system, indeed, was somewhat overloaded with martinetism, pipe-clay, and a too free use of the cane; but its result was to make the Prussian army act with the precision of a machine. Vauban had already united the pike and the musket into one arm by affixing the bayonet, and about the same time the old inconvenient match-lock, or musket fired with a match, had been exchanged for a fusil, or musket with flint and steel. The weapon of the infantry soldier had thus been rendered what it

[1] "I establish the sovereignty like a rock of bronze." Förster's *Friedrich Wilhelm I.* B. i. Urkundenbuch, S. 50.

[2] Frederick William was accustomed to confiscate the estates of his subjects, and even their lives, by scrawling his judgments on the margin of the reports and decrees of his ministers. On one occasion he condemned a tax-collector, who had been sentenced to four years' imprisonment for a deficiency of 4,000 dollars in his accounts, to be hanged. After the poor man had been executed, it was discovered that some false sums had been posted to his debit. Some bags of money were also found, and it appeared evident that he had had no intention to commit a wilful fraud. Büsching's *Beiträge zur Lebensgesch. denkwürdiger Personen*, ap. Menzel, B. v. S. 282.

continued to be down to a recent date. The Prince of Anhalt-Dessau improved the infantry drill, or tactics, by reducing the depth of the line from six men to three, thus increasing the extent and vivacity of the fire; and especially by introducing the cadenced step, the secret of the firmness and swiftness of the Roman legions. From morning to night the Prussian soldiers were engaged in this exercise, and in the uniform and simultaneous use of their weapons.[1] All this was combined with smaller matters of bright coat-buttons and spotless gaiters, which were enforced as rigidly as the more important; and those deficient in them were subjected to the most unmerciful floggings. But the young king knew how to select what was useful in the system, and to reject what was superfluous; and the result, as shown in his first battle, was very surprising.

One of Frederick II.'s first measures was to increase the effective force of his army by several regiments; but at the same time he disbanded the three battalions of gigantic grenadiers, the collecting and exercising of which had been his father's chief pastime and delight. Thus, having a well-filled treasury and a large and well-disciplined army, all the means of acquiring what is commonly called glory were at the young King's disposal; and he candidly tells us that he resolved to use them for that purpose, which he considered essential to the prosperity of his reign.[2] It was, he thought, an enterprise reserved for him to put an end to the mongrel constitution of his State, and to determine whether it should be an electorate or a kingdom.[3] Frederick William, towards the end of his reign, had thought himself slighted and neglected by the Emperor; a coldness had sprung up between the two Courts; but the late King does not seem to have conceived any project of revenge. He appears to have felt his own incapacity for entering into a war; but, pointing to the Crown Prince, he exclaimed with a prophetic bitterness to General Grumkow:—"There stands one who will avenge me!"[4] He little imagined, perhaps, how soon his prophecy would be realized.

[1] Varnhagen von Ense, *Preussische Biographische Denkmale*, B. ii. S. 274 f.

[2] See his letter to Jordan, March 3rd, 1741: "Mon âge, le feu des passions, le désir de la gloire, la curiosité meme, pour ne se rien cacher, enfin un instinct secret m'ont arraché à la douceur du repos que je goutois; et la satisfaction de voir mon nom dans les gazettes, et ensuite dans l'histoire, m'a séduit." Frederick seems to have made the same candid confession of his motives in the first draft of his *Hist. de mon Temps*, but the passage was struck out by Voltaire in his revision of the text. See that writer's *Mémoires* on his connection with Frederick, quoted by Menzel, B. v. S. 292.

[3] *Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. i.

[4] Seckendorf, *Journal Secret*, p. 139, ap. Stenzel, *Gesch. des Preussischen Staats*, B. iii. S. 671.

Yet he had evidently discovered, under those qualities which had once excited his indignation and contempt, the superior genius of his son.

Frederick II. himself, soon after his accession, had found cause to complain of Charles VI.'s conduct towards him in a dispute which he had had with the Bishop of Liége. It was a long while before he would admit to an audience the Imperial envoy, sent to congratulate him on his accession; and when he at length received him, intimated that he perceived in this small affair what he had to expect in more important matters from the friendship of the Court of Vienna.[1] He was thus confirmed in his father's opinion that it was a fixed maxim with the House of Austria rather to retard than advance the progress of the House of Brandenburg. The subject of the Duchy of Berg formed another grievance. By a secret treaty concluded with Charles VI. at Berlin, December 23rd, 1728, Frederick William had again promised to guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction,[2] provided the Emperor procured for him the Duchy of Berg and county of Ravenstein, in case of the extinction of male heirs of the House of Neuburg; but in contravention of this agreement, the Emperor had entered into a treaty with France, January 13th, 1739, by which it was arranged that the Duchies of Berg and Jülich should be assigned to the Sulzbach branch of the Neuburg family, and guaranteed against the attempts of Prussia.[3] Had Charles VI. lived, however, Frederick's attempt upon Silesia would most likely have been indefinitely adjourned. He had made some preparations for obtaining possession of the Duchy of Berg, and would probably have expended his military ardour in that direction had not the unexpected death of the Emperor opened out to him a more promising field of enterprise.

Frederick's invasion of Silesia astonished all Europe, and none more than Queen Maria Theresa, to whom he had given the strongest assurances of friendship. These, indeed, he reiterated after he had entered her territories with his army. He declared to her and to all foreign courts that his only object in invading Silesia, on which he had some ancient claims, was to preserve it

[1] Stenzel, *Gesch. des Preuss. Staats*, Th. iv. S. 60 f.

[2] The Treaty of Wusterhausen, October 12th, 1727, which had also contained a provision to this effect, had never been executed.

[3] Neither the Treaty of 1728 nor 1739 is published, but the facts here stated are taken by Garden (*Hist. des Traités*, t. iii. p. 251) from Dohm, *Ueber den deutschen Fürstenbund*, p. 76, who had the treaties under his eyes.

from being seized by those who had pretensions to the Austrian succession. At the same time he proposed to the Hungarian Queen, in return for the cession of all Silesia, a close alliance with himself, in conjunction with the Maritime Powers and Russia, his assistance in upholding the Pragmatic Sanction, his vote for her husband as Emperor, and an advance of two million dollars.[1] The high-spirited Queen, who was naturally indignant at Frederick's conduct, and had conceived but a mean opinion of the Prussian monarchy, rejected these proposals with contempt. Frederick now began to bargain. He told Maria Theresa that he should be content with part of Silesia; and he now first brought forward in a distinct shape his asserted claims upon that province. They related to the Silesian Duchies of Jägerndorf, Liegnitz, Brieg and Wohlau, and the Lordships of Beuthen and Oderberg. The Margrave John George, a younger son of the House of Brandenburg, had held Jägerndorf, Beuthen, and Oderberg, which belonged to that house, in *apanage*, at the time of the Thirty Years' War; who having taken up arms against the Emperor Ferdinand II. in favour of the Palatine Frederick, the winter King of Bohemia, these possessions had been confiscated. But it was contended that, admitting John George to have been guilty, his fault could not annul the rights of his minor son, still less those of the Electoral House of Brandenburg, in which all alienation of its States was forbidden by family compacts. Liegnitz, Brieg, and Wohlau were claimed in virtue of a treaty of confraternity and succession[2] between the Elector Joachim II. and Duke Frederick II. of Liegnitz in 1537, but declared invalid by the Emperor Ferdinand I. On the death, in 1675, of the last Duke of Liegnitz, of the Polish Piast family, these Duchies had been claimed by Frederick William, the Great Elector of Brandenburg. The Emperor Leopold had, however, persuaded the Elector to abandon his pretensions to them, as well as to Jägerndorf; and by a treaty concluded in 1686 Frederick William had ceded his claims in consideration of receiving the Silesian Circle of Schwiebus. By an understanding with the Electoral Prince, Frederick, the successor of the Great Elector, Leopold, had retained these possessions in 1694, on payment of 225,000 gulden, and on assigning to Frederick the reversion to the principality of East

[1] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 290.

[2] Such treaties were common in that age among German Princes. Thus in the same year we find a renewal of a treaty of a similar nature between the Houses of Saxony, Brandenburg, and Hesse. Pfeffel, vol. ii. p. 150.

Friesland and the counties of Limburg and Speckfeld in Franconia, together with some other privileges.[1]

Such was the nature of the claims advanced by Frederick II. He seems not to have laid much stress upon them himself. They were the pretence, not the cause, of his invasion, and had they not existed, some other pretext for making war would have been discovered. That he was not serious in asserting them appears from his own mouth; since he tells us in his History[2] that in the first months of 1741 he would have been content to accept the duchy of Glogau, or that district of Silesia which lies nearest to the Prussian borders. But in strange contrast with the speculative theories he had laid down in his studies at Rheinsberg and in his *Anti-Macchiavel*, Frederick had now adopted, as an avowed principle of action, that system of lax political morality which most other Princes were content tacitly to follow in practice.

Maria Theresa, who had determined not to begin her reign by dismembering her dominions, and who had then no conception of the part which France was preparing to play against her, again gave Frederick's offers a flat refusal. She accompanied it with the somewhat contemptuous proposal that if he would retire he should be forgiven, and no damages insisted on—an intimation which nettled him exceedingly, though his huckstering negotiations seem well to have deserved it. Frederick meanwhile had pushed on his conquests in Silesia. They were facilitated by the want of preparation on the part of the Austrians, and by the temper of the Protestant inhabitants, who, in many places, welcomed the Prussians as deliverers. By the end of January, 1741, all Silesia, with the exception of Glogau, Brieg, and a few other places, had been overrun almost without opposition. As the season prevented further operations, Frederick returned for a while to Berlin. In March he again appeared at the head of his army. Glogau was taken on the 9th of that month; hence he proceeded to form a junction with Field-Marshal Schwerin, whom he had left in occupation of the southern parts of Silesia; and ignorant of the motions of the Austrians, who had at length assembled in force, he marched upon Jägerndorf, on the frontiers of Moravia, pushing on some of his divisions towards Troppau. Meanwhile Neuperg, the unfortunate commander of the Austrians at the Peace of Belgrade, yet no bad general, who had been released from prison on the accession of Maria Theresa, was advancing from Moravia by way of

[1] See Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. iv. S. 484 Anm.

[2] *Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. i. (Liskenne et Sauvan, *Biblioth. Hist.* t. v. p. 53).

Freudenthal, at the head of 15,000 men, threatening to cut Frederick's line of operation by crossing the mountains towards Ziegenhals and Neisse, and boasting that he would send the young King back to Berlin, to Apollo and the Muses. At the same time another body of Austrians was menacing the Prussians between Jägerndorf and Troppau, and a third, under General Lentulus, was pressing forwards from Glatz. The Prussians were now compelled to retreat, while the Austrians pushed on towards Ohlau, the chief Prussian depôt, and encamped about five miles beyond Brieg, at Mollwitz and the neighbouring villages.

Neuperg's plan of operations was well conceived, but he was too slow in executing it. By advancing to Ohlau, he might have seized all the Prussian artillery and stores. His march, however, had cut off the King's communications with Lower Silesia, and Frederick found it necessary to risk a battle. With this view he advanced by Michelau and Löwen to the village of Pogarell, about six miles from Mollwitz. Here he gave his wearied troops a day's rest, and on the 10th of April, marched in four columns to attack the enemy. In infantry and artillery he was much superior to the Austrians, having 16,000 foot against their 11,000, and 60 guns against 18; but his cavalry consisted of little more than 3,000 men, while the Austrians had 8,000. This explains the fate of the battle. The Prussian cavalry were routed at the first charge; the battle seemed lost; Frederick, at the earnest entreaty of Marshal Schwerin, fled with all speed towards Löwen, escorted by a squadron of cavalry; thence he pushed on to Oppeln, which he reached at night. That place had been occupied by the Austrian hussars, and his demand for admittance was answered by a shower of musket-balls. Frederick now rode back in all haste to Löwen, where he arrived in an exhausted state, having accomplished between fifty and sixty miles in the day. On the following morning he was surprised by the intelligence that his troops had gained the Battle of Mollwitz! This result was owing to the excellent drill of the Prussian infantry, the precision of their manœuvres, the rapidity of their fire.[1] Frederick now rejoined his army, not without some feelings of shame at his premature flight and of anger against Schwerin, the adviser of it, whom he is said never to have forgiven. He neglected, however, to pursue his victory, and instead of attacking the Austrians, who were retreating in disorder within a few miles of him, remained upwards of six weeks inactive in his camp at Mollwitz.

[1] They are said to have delivered five volleys to one of the Austrians.

It must be confessed that Frederick's first appearance against the young and beautiful Queen of Hungary does not show either his chivalrous, his diplomatic, or his military qualities in any very favourable light. His enterprise, however, chiefly from its sudden and unexpected nature, was attended with substantial success. Though not apparently very decisive, the victory of Mollwitz was followed by more important results than perhaps any other battle of the eighteenth century. To Frederick himself it assured the possession of Lower Silesia and the capture of Brieg, while it established the hitherto equivocal reputation of the Prussian troops. But its effect on the policy of Europe was infinitely of more importance, by calling into action those Powers which had postponed their schemes till they should have learnt the issue of Frederick's attempt.

We have seen that Spain and England were already at war, that France was preparing to aid the former Power, and that she had given but equivocal assurances to Maria Theresa, while England was hearty in her support. Among so many claimants, in whole or in part, to the Queen of Hungary's dominions—the Electors of Bavaria and Saxony, the Kings of Prussia, Spain, and Sardinia, besides other minor pretenders[1]—were provided all the elements of a great European conflagration; and France considered it her interest to apply the torch. It seemed a favourable opportunity to revive the schemes of Henry IV. and Richelieu against the House of Austria, to despoil it of a great part of its possessions, and to reduce it to the condition of a second rate Power, so that, on the Continent, France might rule without control. Cardinal Fleury, indeed, now eighty-five years of age, wanted only to enjoy repose, and to respect the guarantee which France had given to the Pragmatic Sanction; but he was overborne by the war party. At the head of this stood Marshal Belle-Isle, a grandson of Fouquet. Belle-Isle saw in the affairs of Austria a favourable opportunity to oppose, and perhaps overturn, Fleury, and to display his own diplomatic and military talents. Through the influence of Madame de Vintimille, one of Louis XV.'s mistresses—for in French affairs these creatures always played a leading part—he obtained the appointment of French minister plenipotentiary at the Electoral Diet to be held at Frankfort, as well as to the Courts of all the German Princes. Thus armed with the power of mischief, he set off in the spring of 1741 on his mission into Germany.

[1] Such as the Duke of Luxembourg, the House of Würtemberg, &c.

France, the ancient ally of the House of Wittelsbach, had by several treaties between 1714 and 1738, promised her aid to the Elector of Bavaria, in his claims to the Austrian succession, in case of the extinction of heirs male in the House of Austria;[1] but these treaties had been superseded by that of Vienna, guaranteeing the Pragmatic Sanction, signed November 18th, 1738.[2] France, however, remained free to support the election of Charles Albert as Emperor; but that would not have suited her views without also investing him with part of the spoils of Austria.[3] The French Cabinet had therefore projected a partition of the Austrian dominions in the following manner:—Bavaria was to have Bohemia, Upper Austria, Tyrol, and the Breisgau; to the Elector of Saxony was to be assigned Moravia with Upper Silesia, with the royal title; to Prussia, Lower Silesia; to Spain, Austrian Lombardy; while to Maria Theresa were to be left the Kingdom of Hungary, the Lower Netherlands, Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola.[4]

Belle-Isle's mission was a successful one. After visiting the Spiritual Electors and procuring their votes for Charles Albert, he proceeded to the King of Prussia's camp at Mollwitz, where he arrived towards the end of April. The camp was soon filled with the ambassadors of other Powers, anxious to gain the support of Frederick in the great contest which impended. In spite of the ardent popular feeling in England in favour of Maria Theresa, it was perceived that, after his victory at Mollwitz, it would be necessary to make some concessions to the King of Prussia; and Lord Hyndford, the English ambassador at the Court of Vienna, was instructed to conciliate him at the smallest sacrifice possible on the part of Austria. Frederick himself was not much inclined to weaken Austria for the benefit of French policy, and still less to become himself dependent on France. Nor had he any inclination to work for Saxony and Bavaria. His sole wish was to secure the greatest possible portion of Silesia, in whatever way that object might be best accomplished. But the high tone assumed by the Queen of Hungary, who insisted that the English and Dutch

[1] Garden, *Traités*, t. iii. p. 255.

[2] Above, p. 70.

[3] "Pouvait-on appuyer sa candidature à l'empire sans appuyer ses autres prétentions, au moins dans la limite nécessaire pour lui donner les moyens de soutenir la dignité impériale?"—Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xv. p. 231. That is, having undertaken to make a beggar an Emperor, somebody must be robbed to fit him out.

[4] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iii. p. 257. In this partition nothing seems to be reserved for France; but, according to Schlosser, *Gesch. des* 18. *Jahrhunderts*, Th. ii. S. 24, the Elector, as Emperor, was never to demand back the towns and provinces which she possessed on the Rhine, *nor what she might conquer in the Netherlands*. Cf. Menzel, B. v. S. 294.

ambassadors should require Frederick totally to evacuate Silesia, put an end to all negotiation in that quarter. Neither Maria Theresa nor her minister, Bartenstein, could believe that France had any serious intention of making war upon her, and she refused to listen to the moderate sacrifices proposed by England. All that she could be prevailed upon to offer was, to place Schwiebus, Grünberg, and Glogau, for a certain time, as pledges in the hands of Frederick.

The King of Prussia was thus, almost of necessity, thrown into the hands of France. As the price of his alliance, however, he stipulated that France should bring two large armies into the field; that she should stir up Sweden to attack and hamper Russia; and that she should induce Augustus, the Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, to join the league.[1] For this last purpose, Belle-Isle proceeded to the Court of Dresden. The conduct of Augustus, who was entirely governed by his selfish and intriguing minister Count Brühl, had been wavering and equivocal. The Queen of Hungary had at first counted upon his friendship, and the guarantee which he had given; but when, in spite of the Elector's warning to the contrary, as one of the Vicars of the Empire during the interregnum, Frederick invaded Silesia, Augustus, instead of remonstrating, displayed a wish to profit by the occasion at the expense of Austria. Maria Theresa had, therefore, found it necessary to propitiate him with the prospect of obtaining the duchy of Crossen, which would connect Saxony with Poland; and he had then entered into an alliance with her for the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction. Nevertheless, he claimed for his son the exercise of the electoral vote of Bohemia, on the ground that it could not be given by a female; and he took it very ill when Maria Theresa, to evade this objection, made her husband Co-Regent, and transferred the vote to him.[2] This afterwards served the Elector as a pretext for joining the Queen's enemies, when he saw her placed in a critical situation through the interference of France, to whose policy he was won by the visit of Belle-Isle, and the prospect held out to him by the Marshal of obtaining Moravia.[3]

The conclusion of the TREATY OF NYMPHENBURG was another motive with the Prussian King, besides Belle-Isle's success with the Elector of Saxony, for joining France.

From Dresden, Belle-Isle had proceeded to Munich, where,

[1] Stenzel, B. iv. S. 137 ff.

[2] *Leben und Character des Grafen von Brühl in vertraulichen Briefen entworfen* (1760), S. 183 f.

[3] Menzel, B. v. S. 294.

towards the end of May, 1741, he had assisted at the conclusion of a treaty between Spain and Bavaria, at the palace of Nymphenburg.[1] The King of Spain pretended to the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia, by virtue of a convention between Philip III. of Spain and Ferdinand, Archduke of Gratz. By this instrument Philip had ceded to the Archduke, his cousin, his claims to Hungary and Bohemia through his mother, Anne, daughter of Maximilian II., reserving, however, the rights of his descendants, in case of the extinction of Ferdinand's male heirs.[2] The Court of Spain was not, however, serious in advancing these antiquated pretensions, which, indeed, clashed with those of Bavaria, its new ally. Its only aim was to profit by the conjuncture by finding some pretext, no matter what, to procure for the Queen's second son, Don Philip, lately married to a daughter of Louis XV., an establishment in Italy, at the expense of Austria. Spain and Bavaria were to enjoy the Austrian spoils, according to the partition already indicated. France made no open declaration of war against Austria. She retained the appearance of supporting Bavaria with auxiliary troops and money, as her ancient ally, and by virtue of the faith of treaties. The King of Spain promised to pay the Elector 12,000 piastres a month for the maintenance of 5,000 men.[3]

The alliance between France, Spain, and Bavaria was soon joined by other Powers. The King of Prussia acceded to it through a treaty concluded in the greatest secrecy with France, June 5th. France guaranteed to Frederick Lower Silesia and Breslau, and he, in return, renounced his claims to Berg in favour of the Palatine House of Sulzbach, favoured by France, and promised his vote for the Elector of Bavaria at the Imperial Diet.[4] The King of Poland, as Elector of Saxony, the King of Sardinia, the Elector Palatine, and the Elector of Cologne, also acceded to the league. Charles Emanuel, King of Sardinia, renewed his pretensions to the Milanese, founded on the marriage contract of his great-great-grandfather with the Infanta Catharine, daughter of Philip II. of Spain.[5]

To this formidable coalition Maria Theresa could oppose only a few allies. England she regarded as the surest of them. The

[1] The Treaty of Nymphenburg has disappeared. It is probable that France was not a party to it, but merely guaranteed it. Garden, t. iii. p. 254. France had begun to subsidize Bavaria some months before.

[2] Rousset, t. xv. p. 6 sqq.

[3] *Nouveau Suppl. au Recueil*, t. i. p. 721; ap. Stenzel, B. iv. S. 138.

[4] Ranke, *Preuss. Gesch.* B. ii. S. 274 ff. Flassan, Garden, and others, give the date of the treaty wrongly as July 5th. Cf. Stenzel, B. iv. S. 143.

[5] Rousset, t. xvi. p. 350.

English people espoused her cause with warmth; but, while Walpole's administration lasted, little was done in her favour except in the way of diplomacy. George II., being in Germany, had, indeed, concluded with her a treaty called the ALLIANCE OF HANOVER (June 24th, 1741), by which he engaged to march 6,000 Danes and 6,000 Hessians to her succour, and to pay her within a year a subsidy of 300,000*l.*[1] The States-General, who at that period generally followed in the track of England, were also in alliance with her; but the aid of these two Powers was not for the first year or two of much service to her cause. The Pope (Clement XII.) had testified great joy at the birth of Maria Theresa's son, the Archduke Joseph; he was ready to lend his spiritual assistance to the Queen, and had in a measure made Frederick's invasion of Silesia an affair of the Church; yet he refused her the loan of a few hundred thousand crowns, and, by raising some pretensions to Parma and Piacenza, even appeared to rank himself among her enemies. A better prospect seemed to open on the side of Russia. The Empress Anna had died a few days after Charles VI. (October 27th, 1740). Ivan, the heir presumptive to the throne, was an infant of two months, the son of Peter's great-niece, Anna,[2] Princess of Mecklenburg, who, in 1739, had married Anthony Ulric, Duke of Brunswick Beveren, the brother-in-law of Frederick of Prussia. After the death of the Empress, her favourite, Biron, Duke of Courland, had seized the Regency, but after a few weeks was overthrown by Münnich and the Princess Anna (November 20th). Though Anna now became Regent, Münnich in reality enjoyed the supreme power, till, towards the end of March, 1741, she dismissed him as too favourable to Prussia. The Regency of Anna lasted till December 6th, 1741, when Peter the Great's daughter, Elizabeth Petrowna, contrived to overthrow her with the aid of only 200 private grenadiers, and became Empress of Russia. Frederick had secured the neutrality of Russia during his invasion of Silesia through Marshal Münnich, who detested the Austrians on account of the Peace of Belgrade; but the Regent Anna had been gained for Maria Theresa's cause by the handsome Pole, Count Lynar, and had promised the Austrian ambassador, Count Botta, to support his mistress's cause with 30,000 or 40,000 men. But the domestic troubles of the

[1] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 295.

[2] Anna was the daughter of Peter's niece Catharine Ivanowna, married to the Duke of Mecklenburg in 1716. Her original Christian name was Elizabeth Catharine Christina, which she changed to Anna on her conversion to the Greek Church in 1733. Le Fort, ap Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. iv. S. 633, Anm.

Muscovite Court, and subsequently the war with Sweden, prevented the realization of this promise.

All being ready for action, the Elector of Bavaria entered the Austrian territories with his forces towards the end of June, 1741, and being joined in August by a French army, he occupied Linz, the capital of Upper Austria, without striking a blow. Here he assumed the title of an Austrian archduke, and received the homage of the States. About the same time the King of Poland had set in motion an army of 20,000 men to march through Bohemia, and take possession of Moravia, his allotted portion. As the ground of his invasion, he proclaimed that Maria Theresa had violated the Pragmatic Sanction by appointing her husband co-Regent. He also published another manifesto, in which he asserted his wife's claims as well as his own to the Austrian inheritance. The former rested on the Act of Succession made by the Emperor Leopold in 1703, as already explained.[1] In his own name he claimed the duchies of Austria and Styria, as descended from the ancient Margraves of Meissen, who, on the extinction of the House of Babenberg, in 1250, should have reaped the Austrian succession, but had been excluded from it by the usurpation, first of Ottocar and then of Rodolph of Habsburg. Augustus also complained that the House of Habsburg had never fulfilled its promise to procure him the succession of Jülich and Cleves, nor compensated him for the damage done by the Swedes in Saxony in 1706, which would not have happened had the Emperor fulfilled his treaty engagements. He also demanded large sums of money owing to him by the Court of Vienna.[2]

The Queen of Hungary's chief security lay in the jealousy which her adversaries felt of one another, and the bad understanding which consequently prevailed among them. The Elector of Bavaria, suspicious of the intentions of the King of Poland, instead of marching on Vienna from Linz, turned to the left and entered Bohemia. With the assistance of the Saxons, who were advancing from the north, Prague was captured, November 26th; and a few days after, Charles Albert caused himself to be crowned King of Bohemia. Meanwhile a French army of more than 40,000 men, under Marshal Maillebois, had entered Westphalia to observe the Dutch, who were arming, and to threaten Hanover. George II. had got together a considerable force, and was preparing to enter Prussia; but the advance of the French, as well

[1] See above, p. 56.
[2] Ohlenschlager, *Gesch. des Interregnums*, ap. Menzel, B. v. S. 295, Anm.

as the presence of a Russian army on the Elbe, compelled him to abandon his purpose. On September 27th he concluded a treaty of neutrality, and promised to give his vote for the Elector of Bavaria as Emperor. At the same time, Maria Theresa was deprived of the aid which she had expected from Russia, in consequence of Sweden, at the instigation of France, having declared war against that Power.[1]

When the part which France meant to play against her became at last but too plain, Maria Theresa wrote some touching letters to Louis XV. and Fleury. She is even said to have offered Louis part of Flanders as the price of his friendship, but without effect. To her complaints of the infraction of the guarantee given in the last Treaty of Vienna, Fleury replied by a miserable subterfuge, and pretended that it supposed the clause, "saving the rights of a third party." To this he added another subtlety. He reminded her that the Emperor had not accomplished the principal article of the treaty, by procuring the sanction of the States of the Empire to the definitive peace.[2] The French invasion had struck Maria Theresa like a thunderbolt. To the last moment she had refused to believe that the French Cabinet would be guilty of so gross a breach of faith. Now everything seemed to threaten impending ruin. She had no allies but the English, and they were far away; she had no money, and scarcely any army. Silesia had been ravished from her, and Bohemia was threatened with the same fate. In this extremity of misfortune she turned her eyes towards Hungary. The House of Habsburg had but small claims to the gratitude of that country. The Hungarian Constitution had been overthrown by her grandfather, Leopold, who had converted it from an elective into an hereditary Monarchy,[3] and many a Hungarian noble preserved in the recesses of his château the portrait of some ancestor veiled with black crape, whose head had fallen by the Austrian axe. Maria Theresa had, indeed, attempted some amends. At her coronation, in the preceding May, she had taken the famous oath of King Andrew II., the *Magna Charta* of the Hungarians; omitting only, with the consent of the Diet, the clause which allowed armed resistance against the Sovereign. The Hungarians, as we have said, had recognized the Pragmatic Sanction, and, though their ancient customs excluded females from the throne, they had proclaimed Maria Theresa after her coronation as their *King* (June 25th). Among this gallant but restless people, she sought a refuge on the approach of her enemies. Ac-

[1] Ohlenschlager, *l.c.* [2] Garden, t. iii. p. 257. [3] See vol. iii. p. 386.

cording to the well-known story, she appeared before the Diet at Pressburg clothed in mourning, with the Crown of St. Stephen upon her head and the sword of the Kings of Hungary at her girdle. In this costume she presented to the assembly her little son, whom she carried in her arms, telling them that she had no longer any hope for her own safety, and that of her family, but in their valour and fidelity; when the chief Magyars, moved by the sight of so much beauty and majesty in distress, at these touching words drew their sabres, crying enthusiastically, "*Moriamur pro rege nostro Maria Theresa.*"[1] Modern researches have shown that the more romantic details of this story, like so many others in history, have either been imagined or compressed for the sake of effect, from the proceedings of two or three days, into one striking dramatic scene. What is really noble and chivalrous in the story, however, consists, not in these extrinsic and theatrical incidents, but in the fact that the gallant Magyars were excited to the highest pitch of loyal devotion by the misfortunes of their young and beautiful Queen. In reply to her appeal, the Diet unanimously voted the "Insurrection of the nobles,"[2] or *levée en masse* of 30,000 foot and 15,000 horse, besides 20,000 recruits for the regular army. Whole hordes of Croats, Pandours, Redmantles, and other tribes dependent on Hungary, flew to arms for the Queen, led by such famous partisan chiefs as Mentzel, Trenk, Bärenklau, and others. Including these tribes the Kingdom of Hungary must have provided at least 100,000 men. The Tyrolese also rose almost in a mass. The ill-advised march of the Elector of Bavaria into Bohemia afforded time to prepare and arm these levies. During Maria Theresa's retreat at Pressburg, her fortune seemed to lie, in a great measure, in the hands of Frederick II., who, with a superior force, was separated only by the Neisse from the sole army which she held in the field, and threatened it with an immediate attack. In these circumstances she listened to the advice of the English Ambassador to conciliate the Prussian King by some concessions. Frederick had promised France and Bavaria to do nothing without their concurrence, and, therefore, he would not commit himself by any written engagements. But at the Castle of Klein-Schnellendorf, and in the presence of Lord

[1] "Let us die for our *king*, Maria Theresa." The proceedings of the Hungarian Diets were conducted in Latin. Count Mailath has shown, in his *Gesch. des östr. Kaiserstaates* (B. v. S. 11 f.), that the tale is compounded from the events of September 11th and 21st. The little Archduke Joseph did not arrive at Pressburg till nine days after his mother had demanded the "Insurrection;" and at the second assembly he was carried not by his mother but by his nurse. Nor were any swords drawn.

[2] *Die adelige Insurrection.*

Hyndford, he came to a verbal agreement with the Austrian generals, Neuperg and Lentulus, that he would content himself with Lower Silesia, with the addition of the town of Neisse; from which, after a little sham fighting, the Austrians were to retire unmolested. Frederick required that the agreement should be kept a profound secret, and the draft of it bore only the signature of Lord Hyndford.[1] A definitive treaty was to be made, if possible, before the end of the year.

After this convention, Frederick expressed the liveliest interest for the Queen of Hungary; yet he broke it in a month, and perhaps had never intended to observe it.[2] Indeed, one might almost suspect that his object was merely to get possession of Neisse and Upper Silesia, without having to fight for them. The tenour of the twelfth article, which empowered part of the Prussian army to take up its winter quarters in Silesia, seems to favour this supposition. A few weeks after the conclusion of this convention, on the pretext that the secret had not been kept, Frederick renewed his connection with the anti-Austrian party by a secret alliance with Saxony and Bavaria at Frankfort (November 1st), and by another Treaty of Guarantee with the latter Power at Breslau (November 4th); by which the Elector, as King of Bohemia, ceded to the King of Prussia, for 400,000 dollars, the county of Glatz, although it was not yet conquered. Meanwhile the Austrians, after a few mock engagements, had surrendered Neisse to the Prussians and evacuated Silesia; and before the end of the year the Prussians occupied Troppau, and even entered Moravia. During these events the Franco-Bavarian and Saxon armies had marched upon Prague, as already related.

The Imperial election was now approaching. The Electoral Diet having assembled at Frankfort in January, 1742, on the 24th of that month the Elector of Bavaria was unanimously chosen King of the Romans and Emperor Elect. The Electors who belonged to the alliance, Saxony, Brandenburg, Cologne, were of course in his favour; the Palatine was his cousin; the Elector of Hanover, George II., as we have said, had bound himself by treaty to vote for Charles Albert; those of Mentz and Trèves had

[1] The Convention is in Garden, t. iii. p. 262 sq.

[2] His own *History* lends some confirmation to this view, where he styles the Convention a "pourparler," and laughs at the Duke of Lorraine (Maria Theresa's husband) for being so simple as to confide in it. "Le duc de Lorraine, qui se trouvait à Presbourg, se flattant que le Roi regarderait des pourparlers comme des traités de paix, lui écrivit demandant sa voix pour l'élection à l'Empire. La réponse fut obligeante, mais conçue dans un style obscur et si embrouillé que l'auteur même n'y comprenait rien."—*Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. ii. sub fin.

been compelled to do so by the threats of Belle-Isle. In order to render the election unanimous, and also apparently to avoid recognizing Maria Theresa as the lawful possessor of Bohemia,[1] the Electoral College had excluded the vote of that Kingdom. The new Emperor was crowned February 12th, and assumed the title of Charles VII. But at the moment when he had attained the object of his ambition, his fortune began to turn. Maria Theresa's Hungarian forces were now in motion; 20,000 men, with the addition of drafts from the Lombard garrisons, under General Khevenhiller, recovered Upper Austria in January. A Franco-Bavarian corps, under Count Ségur and General Minucci, surrendered Linz by capitulation on the 24th of that month. Another Austrian army, under the Grand Duke of Tuscany, augmented by the troops withdrawn from Silesia, after the Convention of Klein-Schnellendorf, which thus proved of temporary advantage to Maria Theresa, entered Bohemia. Khevenhiller, reinforced by 6,000 Croats who had penetrated through Tyrol, invaded Bavaria in February, and took possession of Munich on the 13th, only a few days after Charles VII.'s election had been celebrated in that capital.

On the other hand the King of Prussia had been advancing in Moravia. Olmütz was taken, December 26th. A Prussian division which had been despatched into Bohemia subdued the town and county of Glatz, with the exception of the castle, in January, 1742. When the Austrians were penetrating into Bavaria, Frederick saw the necessity of making a diversion by marching upon Vienna, in conjunction with a French and a Saxon corps. But dissension was already springing up among the allies. Augustus III., or rather his minister, Brühl,[2] was lukewarm in prosecuting a war from which Saxony was to derive but little benefit in comparison with Prussia. He excused himself from furnishing heavy artillery for the siege of Brünn on the ground of want of money, although only a little before Augustus had given 400,000 dollars for a large green diamond! At Znaym the Saxons refused to march further southwards. A body of 5,000 Prussians pushed on, and a party of their hussars showed themselves at Stockerau, only about twenty miles from Vienna. This advance caused 10,000 Austrians to be recalled from Bavaria, and arrested Khevenhiller's further progress towards the west. But

[1] Menzel, *Neure Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 302.

[2] Frederick, who went to Dresden to settle the plan of the campaign, relates that at one of the consultations Brühl got rid of the King by telling him that the opera was about to begin!—*Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. iv.

the ill support which Frederick met with from his allies and the approach of the Austrian and Hungarian forces, compelled him to evacuate Moravia with all his army and to retreat into Bohemia. During this march negotiations went on under the mediation of Lord Hyndford for a peace between Frederick and Maria Theresa. The latter, however, would concede nothing; a bitter spirit was engendered, and Frederick resolved to settle their differences by the arbitrament of a battle with his pursuers; which took place on May 17th in the neighbourhood of Czaslau. The Austrians, commanded by Prince Charles of Lorraine, had slightly the advantage in point of numbers, but Frederick was much superior in artillery. After a long and hard-fought battle, the Austrians retired in good order behind Czaslau, where Frederick forbore to pursue them.

This victory was hailed by the Emperor as a fortunate event; but Frederick had resolved once more to change sides, and the negotiations with the Court of Vienna were renewed. He had now exhausted the greater part of his father's hoards, and he was discontented with and suspicious of his allies. He had discovered that Cardinal Fleury was in secret correspondence with the Court of Vienna, and that the French Court was willing that Sweden, in a peace with Russia, should be compensated at the expense of his Pomeranian dominions.[1] Maria Theresa on her side had been induced by the English minister to make larger concessions. Under these circumstances the preliminaries of a peace were concluded at Breslau, June 11th, 1742, and were followed by the definitive TREATY OF BERLIN, July 28th.[2] By the preliminaries Prussia was to obtain both Lower and Upper Silesia, except the principality of Teschen, the town of Troppau, and the district beyond the Oppa and in the mountains; also, the county of Glatz. But these concessions were somewhat curtailed in the definitive peace. Frederick refused to give any active aid to the Austrian cause, and stipulated only for his neutrality. George II., both as King of Great Britain and Elector of Hanover, the Empress of Russia, the King of Denmark, the States-General, the House of Brunswick, and the King of Poland as Elector of Saxony, were included in the peace; the last, however, only on condition that he should, within sixteen days after formal notice, separate his troops from the French army and withdraw them from Bohemia. Augustus III. hesitated not to avail himself of this article, and

[1] Menzel, B. v. S. 305.
[2] Rousset, t. xviii. pp. 27, 33; Wenck, t. i. pp. 734, 739.

reconciled himself with Austria by reciprocal declarations, without any regular treaty. George II. guaranteed the preliminaries of Breslau by an Act signed at Kensington, June 24th, 1742; and in the following November, Great Britain, Prussia, and the States-General entered into a defensive alliance by the Treaty of Westminster.[1]

In consequence of these arrangements the French, under Belle-Isle, deprived of the co-operation of the Saxons, were forced by the manœuvres of Charles of Lorraine to shut themselves up in Prague, where they were blockaded by the Austrians under Count Königseck. Prague was bombarded by the Austrians on August 19th; but the approach of Maillebois with the French army of Westphalia compelled them to raise the siege and attack Maillebois, whom they drove with considerable loss into Bavaria. Here, however, he obtained some compensation for his failure in Bohemia. Having joined Field-Marshal Seckendorf, who had quitted the Austrian service for that of Charles VII., their united forces succeeded in expelling the Austrians and Hungarians from Bavaria before the close of the year 1642. After Maillebois's retreat the Austrians had again blockaded Prague. But Belle-Isle succeeded in escaping with 16,000 men on the night of December 15th, and after unspeakable sufferings, during a ten days' march in a rigorous season, he arrived, though with great loss, at Eger, on the frontier of the Upper Palatinate. Hence he reached France early in 1743, with only 12,000 men, the remnants of 60,000 with whom he had begun the campaign. The small garrison which he had left in Prague obtained an honourable capitulation, December 26th.

The fortunes of Maria Theresa in other quarters had been as favourable as she might reasonably have anticipated. In Italy, the King of Sardinia had been detached from the confederacy of her enemies. Alarmed by the arrival of large Spanish armies in Italy, Charles Emanuel signed a convention, February 1st, 1742, by which he agreed to aid the Queen of Hungary in defending the duchies of Milan, Parma, and Piacenza; reserving, however, to some future time his own pretensions to the Milanese.[2] Towards the end of 1741, 15,000 Spaniards entered the Tuscan ports, and, in January, 1742, further reinforcements landed in the Gulf of Spezia. The Spanish fleet which conveyed them was accompanied by a French one; an English fleet, under Admiral Haddock,

[1] Rousset, *Ibid.* p. 45; Wenck, t. i. p. 640.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 85; Wenck, *Ibid.* p. 672.

was also in those waters; but the French admiral, having given Haddock notice that if the Spaniards were attacked he should assist them, the English admiral, who did not feel himself a match for both, retired into Port Mahon.[1] It is said, however, that his object in not attacking the Spaniards was to make the King of Sardinia feel his danger and alter his politics. The Spaniards under Montemar were joined by some Neapolitan troops under the Duke of Castropignano. The Spaniards had for their allies Naples and Modena; all the other Italian potentates had declared their neutrality, and among them even Maria Theresa's husband, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, with the view of preserving his dominions. The Italian campaign of 1742 proved, however, altogether unimportant. The English fleet, appearing before Naples, compelled Don Carlos, by a threat of bombardment, to declare his neutrality (August 20th). The Infant Don Philip and the Count de Glime, having entered Provence with 15,000 Spaniards, endeavoured to penetrate into Piedmont by way of Nice; but being repulsed, they entered Savoy by St. Jean Maurienne, and occupied Chambéry early in September. At the beginning of the following month, however, on the approach of the King of Sardinia and General Schulenburg, they hastily evacuated Savoy. The Spaniards and Neapolitans in Lombardy were repulsed by the Austrians, who entered the Modenese, and drove the Spaniards into the Pontifical States. In the north of Europe, the attack of Sweden upon Russia, undertaken in an evil hour, at the instigation of the French, had resulted only in disaster to the Swedes. But in order to explain this, we must for a moment interrupt the narrative, and briefly advert to the history of the Swedish nation.

The treaties by which the great Northern War had been concluded seemed to have placed the Scandinavian kingdoms in a position to enjoy a long period of tranquillity. This was really the case with Denmark, where the wise and paternal government of Frederick IV., who died in 1730, and of his successor, Christian VI., was, during many years, almost solely occupied with the care of preserving the peace and increasing and consolidating the national prosperity. Sweden, however, adopted a different line of policy. She could not digest the losses inflicted upon her by the Treaty of Nystädt, and the war in which the question of the Austrian Succession had embroiled Europe seemed to present a favourable opportunity to avenge her injuries.

Unfortunately, however, the form of government which had

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 321.

been adopted in Sweden since the revolution of 1719,[1] rendered her peculiarly unfit for such an enterprise. The new constitution had been principally the work of Count Arved Horn, one of the chiefs of the old nobility. Horn wished to put an end to the arbitrary absoluteness with which Charles XI. and Charles XII. had reigned; but he introduced in its stead only the abuse of popular freedom clothed in legal forms. King Frederick I., the husband of Ulrica Eleanora, who was also reigning Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, had neither talent nor resolution to oppose these innovations, but tamely submitted to all the dictates of the oligarchy. It was not he that governed, but the Council, or rather that member of it who, as President of the Chancery, stood at the head of the Ministry. The Council itself, however, whose members were elected by a deputation from which the fourth estate, or that of the peasants, was excluded, was under the control of the Secret Committee of the Diet. To this committee, from which it received its instructions, and which had the power of retaining it or dismissing it from office, the Council was obliged to give an account of its proceedings from one Diet to another. The real power of the State, therefore, was vested in the Secret Committee, which consisted of 100 members; of whom fifty belonged to the Order of the Nobles, twenty-five to the clergy, and twenty-five to the burgher class. The Order of the Peasants was here also excluded. Such a constitution, of course, threw the chief power into the hands of the nobility. This class, the majority of which consisted, as in Poland, of impoverished families with lofty pretensions, whilst it thus tyrannized at once over king and people, was itself the slave of its passions and the sport of faction. The heads of the different parties sold themselves to foreign Powers, which sought either to retain Sweden in a state of weakness or to make her the tool of their own interests. The two chief factions were led by Counts Horn and Gyllenborg. Till the year 1734, Gyllenborg's faction had inclined to Russia, that of Horn to France; but at the Diet of that year they changed sides, and in June, 1735, Gyllenborg persuaded the Secret Committee to conclude a Treaty of Subsidies with the Court of Versailles.[2] Count Horn, however, having shortly after brought about, through his intrigues, an alliance with Russia, France refused to ratify. The poorer nobility, a numerous body, whose chance of bettering themselves lay only in war, and many of whom served in the French army, were loud in their complaints of the King's love of

[1] See Vol. III. p. 531. [2] Rousset, *Recueil*, t. xviii. Suppl. p. 302.

peace, and now added their weight to the Gyllenborg party. It was the policy of the Court of Versailles to foment the hatred of the Swedes against Russia, with the view of producing a war, which seemed to be the surest means of re-establishing the royal authority. Since the late revolution, Sweden had become almost a nullity, because the least warlike movement required the convocation of the States of the kingdom; and hence, under this system of government, the alliance of Sweden was almost useless to France. Great Britain, on the contrary, together with Denmark and Russia, favoured a state of things which seemed to insure the maintenance of peace—an assumption, however, which the sequel proved to be erroneous.

After a few years Count Horn was driven from office by the Secret Committee, composed almost wholly of members of the Gyllenborg faction; but the war and peace factions, or the partisans of France and Russia, continued to exist; and in their disputes at the Diet of 1738 they reciprocally bestowed upon each other the nicknames of *Hats* and *Nightcaps*. The conquest of Livonia was the object of the *Hats*, or war party, who, in November, 1738, effected a treaty with France for an alliance of ten years, during three consecutive years of which France was to furnish an annual subsidy of 300,000 crowns.[1] A brutal act on the part of the Russian Government envenomed the hostility of the *Hats* against that Power. The more extended political relations which had sprung up in the eighteenth century, chiefly through Peter the Great and the appearance of Russia as a first-rate Power, now embraced Europe through its whole extent. Nations which had formerly been almost ignorant of one another's existence, or, at all events, profoundly indifferent to one another's policy, now found themselves brought into contact by common interests and sympathies. The vast extent of the Russian Empire, touching Sweden on the north and Turkey on the south, had united the Scandinavian and the Osmanli against a common aggressor; and the Swedish Government had perceived that the aid and friendship of the Sublime Porte would be of essential service to it in any contest with Russia. In January, 1737, a Treaty of Commerce had been concluded with the Porte;[2] and in the following year Major Malcolm Sinclair was despatched to Constantinople to negotiate a Treaty of Alliance and Subsidies.

These negotiations had excited the jealousy and suspicion of the Russian Government, which was then at war with the Porte.

[1] Wenck, *Cod. jur. g. rec.* t. ii. p. 1. [2] *Ibid.* t. i. p. 471.

In order to learn the object of them it was determined to waylay and murder Sinclair, and to seize his despatches, and the consent of the King of Poland's Ministry, as well as of the Cabinet of Vienna, was obtained to any act of violence which might be perpetrated on Sinclair during his journey. On his return from Constantinople, in June, 1738, he was tracked and pursued through Poland by some Russian officers; but it was not till he had reached Silesia that they found a convenient opportunity to attack him. The Austrian magistrates at Breslau gave them a warrant to pursue him; he was overtaken near Grüneberg, dragged from his carriage into a neighbouring wood, where he was shot and his despatches seized. These, after they had been duly read by the Russian officials, were transmitted to Gyllenborg, who then filled the post of Swedish Vice-Chancellor, by the Hamburg post, in a well-sealed and apparently original packet. One Couturier, however, who had accompanied Sinclair on his journey, and who, on his arrival at Dresden, had, at the instance of the Russian Ambassador in that capital, been confined for a short period at Sonnenstein, on his arrival at Stockholm, in August, related all that had happened.[1] The Russian Empress Anna, in a circular to the foreign ministers, disclaimed all knowledge of this barbarous violation of international law; the murderers of Sinclair were banished into Siberia, probably in order that they might not betray the real secret; and they were not released till the accession of Elizabeth. But the fate of Sinclair roused in Sweden a cry for vengeance which re-echoed through the Kingdom. The *Hats* seized the occasion to lash the old national hatred of the Swedes against the Russians into fury. Towards the end of 1739 a defensive alliance was concluded with the Porte; preparations were made for an attack upon Russia, and troops were despatched into Finnland; but the Peace of Belgrade, which enabled Russia to march 80,000 men to Finnland, and the earnest dissuasions of France from a war from which Sweden could derive no advantage, induced the Swedish Government to postpone the hour of vengeance.

The breaking out of the war of the Austrian Succession seemed to offer a favourable opportunity for attacking Russia. France, as we have said, in order to divert the Russian forces, now exhorted the Swedish Government to avail themselves of it; and, by encouraging the plans of the Princess Elizabeth against the government of the infant Czar Ivan, and the Regent Anna, his

[1] Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. iv. S. 600 f.

mother, endeavoured to embarrass the Russian Government. An extraordinary Diet, convoked at Stockholm, declared war against Russia, August 4th, 1741. The Swedish manifest charged the Court of St. Petersburg with violating the Peace of Nystädt, interfering with the Swedish constitution, especially as regarded the succession to the throne, prohibiting the exportation of grain from Livonia, excluding the Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp from the Russian throne, and finally, with causing the assassination of Major Sinclair.[1] The object of Sweden was to reconquer the boundaries which she had possessed in 1700. But the dominant party took not the proper steps to insure success. Finnland, the destined theatre of war, was unprovided with troops and magazines; and General Löwenhaupt, to whom the chief command was intrusted, had neither military knowledge nor experience. The hopes of a diversion by the Ottoman Porte were frustrated, and even the expectations founded on the French alliance proved exaggerated.

We shall not pursue the details of the war which ensued, which was shamefully conducted through the selfishness of the Swedish oligarchy. It was interrupted for two or three months by an armistice consequent on the revolution, which, in December, 1741, placed the Empress Elizabeth, second daughter of Peter the Great, on the throne of Russia. The Empress Anna might have ruled without control, and probably have transmitted the throne to her son Ivan, had Elizabeth been left to the quiet enjoyment of her sensual propensities. Elizabeth indulged without concealment or restraint in amours with subalterns, and even privates of the guard whose barracks lay near her residence; she was addicted, like them, to strong drink, and had entirely gained their favour by her good humour and joviality. Her indolence made her utterly averse to business. She would never have thought of encumbering herself with the care of government had she not been restricted in her amusements, reproved for her behaviour, and, what was worst of all, threatened with a compulsory marriage with the ugly and disagreeable Anthony Ulrich, of Brunswick Bevern, brother of the Regent's husband. At the instigation, and with the money, of the French ambassador, La Chétardie, a revolution was effected, in which Lestocq, a surgeon, son of a French Protestant settled in Hanover, and one of Elizabeth's friends, was the chief agent. In the night of December 5th, 1741, Elizabeth was escorted by about a hundred soldiers of

[1] Büsching, *Magazin*, ap. Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xiii. p. 340.

the guard, who had previously secured the officer of the watch, to the Winter Palace, where they were joined by the rest of the soldiery. The Empress, her son Ivan, and his sister, and all the members of the Government were arrested by their own sentinels, and by eight o'clock in the morning the revolution was accomplished. The Empress and her husband were conducted under custody from one place to another; while the unfortunate Ivan was thrown into a wretched dungeon, and treated as an idiot. Marshal Münnich, Ostermann, and others were banished to Siberia.

Elizabeth, in the manifest which she published on the day of her accession, declared that the throne belonged to her by *right of birth*, in face of the celebrated ukase, issued by her father in 1722, which empowered the reigning Sovereign to name his successor;[1] and her whole reign promised to be a Muscovite reaction against the principles of reform and progress adopted by Peter the Great. On communicating her accession to the Swedish Government, she expressed her desire for peace, and her wish to restore matters to the footing on which they had been placed by the Treaty of Nystädt. The Swedes, who took credit for having helped the revolution which raised her to the throne, demanded from the gratitude of the Empress the restitution of all Finnland, with the town of Wiborg and part of Carelia; but Elizabeth, with whom it was a point of honour to cede none of the conquests of her father, would consent to nothing further than the re-establishment of the Peace of Nystädt. On the renewal of the war the Swedes were again unsuccessful in every encounter. General Bousquet, who had succeeded Löwenhaupt, cashiered for incapacity and afterwards beheaded, concluded a disgraceful capitulation with the Russians, September 4th, 1742, by which ten Finnish regiments were disarmed, and the Swedish regiments permitted to return home only on condition of abandoning all Finnland.

These events spread consternation throughout Sweden. Peace was now earnestly desired, and the Diet was summoned to deliberate on the situation of the Kingdom. The Swedish Queen, Ulrica Eleanora, who, in spite of her close affinity with the House of Holstein, was always decidedly opposed to it, had died, November 23rd, 1741; and the Diet, in order to conciliate the Empress Elizabeth, resolved to name her nephew, Charles Peter Ulric, Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, to the succession of the Swedish

[1] See vol. iii. p. 74.

throne. But Elizabeth had higher views for that young prince. Before the arrival of the Swedish deputies at St. Petersburg, she had declared him Grand Duke and heir presumptive of the Russian throne, and he publicly embraced the Greek confession of faith.

At this period Russia renewed her alliance with Great Britain, with a view to the preservation of the general peace of Europe, and especially that of the North. By the Treaty of Moscow, December 11th, 1742, the two Powers were reciprocally to help and advise each other in their wars, except those which Russia might wage with the Ottoman Porte and the East, or those which England might be carrying on in the Spanish peninsula and in Italy. The Kings of Poland and Prussia and the States-General were to be invited to accede to the treaty.[1] This alliance increased the difficulties of the Swedish Government, and caused them to throw their eyes upon Denmark, as the only Power which could aid them in their distress. A project was formed to renew the ancient union of the three Scandinavian kingdoms, and Christian VI. of Denmark, on condition that his son Frederick should be appointed to the succession of the Swedish Crown, offered the aid of twelve ships of the line, and of an army of 12,000 men. The report of this alliance helped the Swedes in their negotiations with Russia in the Congress already opened at Abo in Finnland. The Russians wished to preserve the greater part of their conquests; but the menace of the Swedish plenipotentiaries that if a peace were not concluded by June 26th, 1743, the Prince Royal of Denmark should be elected to succeed to the Swedish throne, induced the Court of St. Petersburg somewhat to moderate its pretensions. Elizabeth wished to procure the Crown of Sweden for Adolphus Frederick of Holstein-Gottorp, Bishop of Lübeck, who was the guardian of her nephew, Charles Peter Ulric. Preliminaries were signed and an armistice agreed on, June 27th: when, after the election of Adolphus Frederick by the Swedes, the restitution of the Swedish provinces by Russia was to be arranged in a definitive treaty.[2]

The peasants of Dalecarlia, incited, it is said, by a promise of assistance from Denmark, and supported with Danish money, opposed the election of the Russian nominee. They even entered Stockholm in arms, and it became necessary to employ the regular troops against them. After this insurrection had been quelled, the Bishop of Lübeck was elected, July 4th, 1743; and the treaty of

[1] Wenck, t. i. p. 645. [2] *Ibid.* t. ii. p. 31.

peace was then proceeded with and signed, August 17th. By the Treaty of Abo[1] Sweden ceded to Russia in perpetuity all the provinces and places assigned to the latter Power by the Peace of Nystädt. Russia, on the other hand, restored her recent conquests, except the Province of Kymmenegord, the towns and fortresses of Friedrichshamn and Willmanstrand, and some other places. Henceforth the river Kimmené was to form the boundary of the two States. The inhabitants of the places ceded by Sweden were to enjoy their former civil and religious privileges. The Russians insisted upon a clause for the extradition not only of fugitive criminals, but even subjects. Their object was to be able to reclaim the serfs who might cross the borders; but it is singular that the Swedes should have made the condition reciprocal, the Swedish peasants being not only free, but even forming one of the orders of the national States.

By this peace Sweden for ever renounced the hope of recovering the provinces situated on the Gulf of Finnland. The conclusion of it, and the election of Adolphus Frederick of Holstein as successor to the Swedish Throne, had nearly involved Sweden in a war with Denmark. Christian VI. prepared to assert by force the rights of his son; George II., as Elector of Hanover, was disposed to assist him; while the Empress of Russia sent to the aid of Sweden a formidable fleet and army, and promised a subsidy of 400,000 roubles. After much negotiation, however, an arrangement was concluded in February, 1744, by which the Prince Royal of Denmark renounced his pretensions to the Swedish Succession.

But we must now return, in another chapter, to the war of the Austrian Succession, in which Great Britain was preparing to take a more decisive part.

[1] Wenck, t. ii. p. 36.

CHAPTER XLVI.

THE year 1743 opened with the death of Cardinal Fleury (January 29th), who had attained his ninetieth year, and was almost sunk in the dotage of a second childhood. A few months before his death, when Belle-Isle and his army were in jeopardy in Bohemia, Fleury had instructed him to make peace at any price; and at the same time, in a letter to Field-Marshal Königseck, the Austrian commander, with whom Belle-Isle had to treat, denounced him as the author of the war, declared that it had been undertaken against his own feelings and principles, and made something very like an appeal to the mercy of the Court of Vienna. Maria Theresa immediately caused this effusion to be published, and exposed the Cabinet of Versailles to the laughter of all Europe.[1] After Fleury's death Louis XV. declared that in future he should govern for himself, but, in fact, left the conduct of affairs to the heads of the four ministerial departments. The natural consequence was an almost complete anarchy in the Government.

England also had previously lost her pacific minister by the retirement of Sir Robert Walpole.[2] The cause of Maria Theresa had begun to excite a remarkable enthusiasm in England. Even the women had raised by private subscription a large fund for her use, to which the Duchess of Marlborough is said to have contributed 40,000*l.*; but the high-spirited young Queen declined to receive an aid which bore the appearance of alms. The desire of the English for more decisive measures was further stimulated by the ill-success which had hitherto attended their naval expeditions to America, which was attributed to Walpole. The Convention of Neutrality, entered into by George II. in September, 1741, and the extortion of his vote for the Elector of Bavaria, properly concerned that Prince only as Elector of Hanover; yet, as he was also King

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xv. p. 250 sq.

[2] It is surely beneath the dignity of History that M. Martin (*ibid.* p. 248), after Flassan, should quote as genuine from Coxe's *Memoirs of Sir R. Walpole*, vol. i. p. 686 note, a pretended letter of Walpole's to Cardinal Fleury, requesting three million livres to buy members of Parliament, without intimating that Coxe cites it *as a fabrication*.

of England, these acts were deemed a disgrace by the English people. The elections that year went against Walpole, and, in February, 1742, he found himself compelled to resign. He was succeeded in the administration by Pulteney, Earl of Bath, though Lord Carteret, an ardent supporter of the cause of Maria Theresa, was virtually Prime Minister. Bath's accession to office was immediately followed by a large increase of the army and navy; five millions were voted for carrying on the war, and a subsidy of 500,000*l.* for the Queen of Hungary. The Earl of Stair, with an army of 16,000 men, afterwards reinforced by a large body of Hanoverians and Hessians in British pay, was despatched into the Netherlands to co-operate with the Dutch. But though the States-General, at the instance of the British Cabinet, voted Maria Theresa a subsidy, they were not yet prepared to take an active part in a war which might ultimately involve them in hostilities with France. The exertions of the English Ministry in favour of the Queen of Hungary had, therefore, been confined during the year 1742 to diplomacy, and they had helped to bring about, as we have already seen, the Peace of Breslau. In 1743 they were able to do more; but we must first cast our eyes on the affairs of the Emperor and the Queen of Hungary.

By the expulsion of the Austrians from Bavaria, recorded in the preceding chapter, Charles VII. was enabled to return to Munich in April, 1743. Seckendorf now advised him to follow the example of Prussia and Saxony, and make his peace with Maria Theresa. Charles, however, could not resolve to humble himself before the proud young Queen whose Crown he had so recently claimed as his property. While he was debating the point with the French generals, a Bavarian division of 7,000 men under Minucci was attacked by the Austrians under Prince Charles of Lorraine and Khevenhiller at Simbach, near Braunau, and almost annihilated (May 9th). After this blow, Broglie, who had assumed the command of the French army in Bavaria, and who was always at variance with Seckendorf, suddenly set off for the Rhine with his troops, thus leaving Bavaria again at the mercy of the Austrians, as Seckendorf, with his remaining 10,000 men, was unable to defend it. On June 12th the Austrian general, Nadasti, took Munich after a short bombardment. Charles VII. was now again obliged to fly, and took refuge at Augsburg. At his command Seckendorf made a Convention with the Austrians, by which he agreed to abandon to them Bavaria, on condition that Charles's troops should be allowed to occupy unmolested quarters between

Franconia and Suabia. Maria Theresa seemed at first indisposed to ratify even terms so humiliating to the Emperor. She had become, perhaps, a little too much elated by the rapid turn of fortune. She had caused herself to be crowned in Prague, had received the homage of the Austrians, and entered Vienna in a sort of triumph. She now dreamt of nothing less than conquering Lorraine for herself, Alsace for the Empire; of hurling Charles VII. from the Imperial Throne, and placing on it her own consort. She would not recognize Charles as Emperor, but accorded to him the title only of "Elector of Bavaria," and threatened to treat his troops as enemies wherever she should find them. But she was at length mollified, and consented that the Bavarian army, so long as it betrayed no design to renew hostilities, should remain in some neutral State of the Empire. She now caused the Bavarians to take an oath of fidelity and obedience to herself; whereupon the Emperor published an indignant protest against this proceeding of the "Grand Duchess of Tuscany."[1]

Meanwhile the allied army of English and Germans, under the Earl of Stair, nearly 40,000 strong, which, from its destined object, had assumed the name of "the Pragmatic Army," had crossed the Meuse and Rhine in March and April, with a view to cut off the army of Bavaria from France. George II. had not concealed his intention of breaking the Treaty of Hanover, of 1741, alleging, as a ground, that the duration of the neutrality stipulated in it had not been determined, and had joined the army in person. He found it in a most critical position. Lord Stair, who had never distinguished himself as a general, and was now falling into dotage, had led it into a narrow valley near Aschaffenburg, between Mount Spessart and the river Main; while Marshal Noailles, who had crossed the Rhine towards the end of April, by seizing the principal fords of the Main, both above and below the British position, had cut him off both from his magazines at Hanau, and from the supplies which he had expected to procure in Franconia. Nothing remained for him but to fight his way back to Hanau; but to accomplish this it was necessary to pass the village of Dettingen, at the other extremity of the valley, which the French had occupied in force; while the line of march lay along the river Main, the opposite bank of which was occupied by the French, whose artillery began to make dreadful havoc among the British columns. Noailles had fortunately intrusted the command of the French division posted at

[1] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 308 f.

Dettingen to his nephew, the Duke of Gramont, an inexperienced young man, who, thinking that he had to deal only with an advanced guard, quitted the strong position he had taken up to give battle—a movement by which he placed himself between the British and the French batteries, and compelled the latter to suspend their fire. The British and Hanoverian infantry, with the King and the Duke of Cumberland at their head, now charged and routed the French, and thus opened the road to Hanau. In the BATTLE OF DETTINGEN, fought on June 27th, the French are said to have lost about 6,000 men, and the British half that number. It is the last action in which a King of England has fought in person. But George II., or rather Lord Stair, did not know how to profit by his victory. Although the Pragmatic Army was joined, after the battle of Dettingen, by 15,000 Dutch troops, under Prince Maurice of Nassau, nothing of importance was done during the remainder of the campaign. The French did not retire into Alsace till the approach of Prince Charles of Lorraine with the Austrians, in August. The Croats, Pandours and other Austrian partisans made forays as far as Lorraine; but towards the end of autumn the allies cantoned their forces in winter quarters.

The Emperor Charles VII., abandoned by all the world, had endeavoured to obtain the neutrality of his hereditary dominions, which Maria Theresa refused to grant without the concurrence of her allies; though, as we have said, she gave a verbal declaration that she would not attack the Bavarian army so long as it remained on neutral ground. Braunau and Straubing were surrendered to the Austrians; Ingolstadt was taken early in October; and Charles VII., without dominions or money, went to hold his melancholy Court at Frankfort. Much negotiation went on in the course of 1743 between him and Lord Carteret, for a settlement of his affairs with the Queen of Hungary. In answer to his last proposal in August, the English Minister finally told him that Maria Theresa would make no peace unless she received entire satisfaction; that she demanded Lorraine, and would meanwhile hold Bavaria in pledge for it; that if Charles Albert desired a sincere reconciliation he should cause the German States to declare war against France, in order to reunite Alsace to the Empire, and cause Lorraine to be ceded to the Queen; and that on this condition—which was of course an impossible one—Great Britain and the States-General would furnish him with subsidies.

Much negotiation had also been going on in other quarters.

As it was suspected that the King of Sardinia would not observe the Convention of February, 1742, so unsatisfactory to his ambition, and that he would again listen to the overtures of France and Spain, the English Ministry persuaded Maria Theresa to make a sacrifice in order to retain him. By a treaty between Great Britain, the Queen of Hungary, and the King of Sardinia, signed at Worms, September 23rd, 1743,[1] Charles Emanuel renounced his pretensions to Milan; the Queen of Hungary ceding to him the Vigevanesco, that part of the Duchy of Pavia between the Po and the Ticino, the town and part of the Duchy of Piacenza, and a portion of the district of Angera: also *whatever rights she might have* to the marquisate of Finale.[2] The Queen of Hungary promised to increase her army in Italy to 30,000 men as soon as the affairs of Germany would permit; while the King of Great Britain engaged to keep a strong fleet in the Mediterranean, and to pay Charles Emanuel annually 200,000*l.* so long as the war lasted, he keeping in the field an army of 45,000 men.

While Maria Theresa was thus procuring a slippery ally her enemies were drawing closer their league against her. France and Spain signed a secret treaty of perpetual alliance at Fontainebleau, October 25th, 1743. The treaty is remarkable as the precursor of the celebrated *Family Compact* between the French and Spanish Bourbons. The Spaniards, indeed, call it the *Second Family Compact*, the first being the Treaty of November 7th, 1733 (*supra*, p. 83), of which, with regard to colonial affairs, it was a renewal. But this treaty had a more special reference to Italy. Louis XV. engaged to declare war against Sardinia, and to aid Spain in conquering the Milanese. Philip V. transferred his claims to that Duchy to his son, the Infant Don Philip, who was also to be put in possession of Parma and Piacenza. All the possessions ceded by France to the King of Sardinia, by the Treaty of Utrecht, were to be again wrested from him. A public alliance was to be formed, to which the Emperor Charles VII. was to accede; whose States, and even something more, were to be recovered for him. Under certain circumstances war was to be declared against England; in which case France was to assist in the recovery of Gibraltar, and also, if possible, of Minorca. The new colony of Georgia was to be destroyed, the *Asiento* withdrawn

[1] Rousset, *Recueil*, t. xviii. p. 83; Wenck, *Cod. jur. g. rec.* t. i. p. 677.

[2] The marquisate of Finale had been sold to the Genoese by Charles VI., and Maria Theresa had, consequently, no legal claim to it. Pfeffel, t. ii. p. 500.

from England,[1] &c. Hence the year 1744 opens a new phase of the war, of which the most remarkable events are, the declaration of war by France against Maria Theresa and George II., the union formed in favour of the Emperor, and the fresh rupture between Austria and Prussia.

Early in that year many indications betrayed the tone of France towards Great Britain. Louis XV., at the instigation of Cardinal Tencin, who owed his hat to the Pretender, called at Rome James III., invited the Chevalier de St. George, son of that phantom Monarch, into France, with the view of assisting him in a descent upon England. An armament was prepared at Brest; the English fleet was to be overpowered, although there had yet been no declaration of war, and 15,000 men were to be thrown on the coasts of Great Britain. The news of these preparations created some alarm in England. Precautions were taken against an invasion, and the Dutch, under the treaties of 1678 and 1716, sent 6,000 men into England. In February a descent was actually attempted, but without success, as Admiral Norris, aided by a tremendous storm, proved too strong for the French fleet. About the same time (February 24th) a drawn action took place between the French, Spanish, and English fleets, near Toulon. The disputes between the English admirals, Matthews and Lestock, prevented them from acting in concert, and compelled Matthews to withdraw. The Spaniards and French, however, also complained of each other, and the quarrels of their admirals left the English masters of the Mediterranean;[2] though the immediate result of the battle was that the Spaniards were enabled to send large supplies into Italy.

The campaign in that country, in 1743, had not proved much more important than that of the preceding year. In December, 1742, and in the following February, the Spaniards and French had renewed their attempts to penetrate into Piedmont (*supra*, p. 106), but without success. On February 8th, Montemar, in attempting to form a junction with them, fought a drawn action

[1] The treaty does not seem to have been published in the usual collections, but it is in Cantillo, *Tratados de Paz*, 307, ap. Ranke, *Preuss. Gesch.* B. iii. S. 142.

[2] M. Martin, speaking of this action, says, "Les alliés sortirent de la rade le 19 Février, et livrèrent aux Anglais, le 22, un combat qui resta indécis. C'était un résultat *très-honorable* pour ceux qui étaient les plus faibles en navires et en canons."—*Hist. de France*, t. xv. p. 267. Here M. Martin suppresses the dissension between the English admirals, and the fact that the *honour* of the result was claimed *by the Spaniards alone*, and that the French admiral, De Court, was disgraced. See Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. p. 345 sq.

with the Austrians under Count Traun, at Campo Santo, on the Tanaro. The Prince de Conti and Don Philip passed the Var and succeeded in occupying Nice, in April; but were compelled to relinquish the enterprise, as the Genoese Senate, alarmed by the threats of Admiral Matthews, who told them that if they permitted the French and Spaniards to pass through their territories, he should regard it as a breach of their neutrality and commence hostilities against them accordingly, refused the invaders a passage. They were, therefore, compelled to retire, leaving garrisons in Nice and Villa Franca. They then made an attempt by the valley of Barcelonette (July), penetrated into the valley of the Stura, and laid siege to Coni, September 12th. The King of Sardinia gave them battle on the 30th of that month at Madonna dell' Olmo; and, although they gained the advantage, the autumn floods and want of supplies compelled them to raise the siege (October 22nd), and retire with great loss over the mountains. Meanwhile, in Southern Italy, the Austrians had advanced into the Campagna. Don Carlos, believing himself menaced, marched against them; many bloody skirmishes took place in the neighbourhood of Veletri, but nothing decisive was accomplished, and in November the Austrians retired.

Louis XV. made a formal declaration of war against George II. (March 15th, 1744), and against Maria Theresa (April 26th), and in May he put himself at the head of the grand army of the Netherlands. He is said to have been stimulated to this unwonted energy by a new mistress, Madame de la Tournelle, whom he created Duchess de Châteauroux; the fourth sister of the family of Nesle that had successively passed into his incestuous embraces.[1] The army numbered 80,000 men under the command of Marshal Noailles and Count Maurice of Saxony. The latter, who, under the name of Marshal Saxe, became so celebrated as a general, was one of the numerous natural sons of Augustus II., the late King of Poland, by the beautiful Aurora von Königsmark, the foiled tempter of Charles XII. of Sweden. He had procured himself to be elected Duke of Courland by the States of that Duchy in 1726, and, after disputing his title with an heroic temerity against Russia and Poland, had finally placed himself in the service of France. Noailles had seen and appreciated his military genius in

[1] It is related that the King's confessor, the Jesuit Lémeri, not being able to give him absolution, advised him, in order to save appearances, to communicate *in blank*, or with unconsecrated wafers. Louis was so shocked with the proposal that he banished the confessor. *Chronique du règne de Louis XV.* ap. Martin, t. xv. p. 265. The story reflects still less credit on the Jesuit than on the King.

Bohemia, and as France was in want of generals, procured for him a marshal's bâton, though the King was prejudiced against him as a Protestant. During the month of June, Courtrai, Menin, Ypres, the fort of Knoque, Dixmude, successively yielded to the arms of Louis. Meanwhile, however, the advance of the Austrians threatened the safety of Alsace, and the King, after taking Furnes, July 10th, hastened with the *élite* of his troops to the protection of that Province, leaving Marshal Saxe in Flanders to conduct a defensive campaign, which covered him with glory.

Prince Charles of Lorraine and Field-Marshal Traun, crossing the Rhine a few leagues from Philippsburg, had seized Lauterburg, Weissenburg, and the line of the Lauter. The French Marshal, Coigny, reinforced by the Emperor's Bavarians—the neutrality agreed upon having been broken and repudiated—after retaking Weissenburg, which he could not hold, had retreated behind the Moder, and afterwards on Strasburg. Parties of Croats, Hungarians, and other Austrian partisans, now inundated Alsace, and even pressed on into Lorraine. The King had fallen sick at Metz, where his life was despaired of;[1] but Noailles succeeded in effecting a junction with Coigny by the defile of Ste. Marie aux Mines. Prince Charles now received orders to recross the Rhine; an operation which he effected with little loss in the face of a superior enemy. The Queen of Hungary, abandoning for the present the project of reconquering Alsace and Lorraine, recalled her troops in order to repel an invasion of Bohemia by the King of Prussia. But we must trace this affair a little higher.

The Treaty of Worms (*supra*, p. 118) had given great offence to Frederick. By the second article of it the contracting parties guaranteed to one another all the kingdoms, states, &c., which they then possessed, or which *they were entitled to possess*, in virtue of the Treaties of Turin (1703), Utrecht, and Baden, the Quadruple Alliance, the Treaty of Vienna (March, 1731), the consequent guarantee of the Empire (January, 1732), the Act of Accession, signed at Vienna, November 12th, 1738, and that signed at Versailles, February 3rd, 1739.[2] This was, in fact, to guarantee to the Queen of Hungary the reconquest of Silesia. Frederick's anger and alarm were increased by a clause of the Thirteenth Article: that as soon as Italy should be delivered from

[1] The Parisians, in their joy for his recovery, and in admiration of his warlike exploits, gave him the name of *Louis le bien aimé;* a *sobriquet* which is said to have roused in him no feeling except a well-founded astonishment. Voltaire. *Guerre de* 1741, ap. Martin, t. xv. p. 271.

[2] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*. t. iii. p. 294; Wenck, B. i. p. 682; cf. *Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. viii.

its enemies, the King of Sardinia should furnish men for the safeguard of Lombardy, in order that the Queen might be enabled to withdraw part of her troops from that country and employ them in Germany.

In Germany? Against whom? Maria Theresa was allied with Saxony. She had humiliated Bavaria. Against whom, then, could she meditate war but Prussia? There was an end, Frederick concluded, to the Peace of Breslau, especially as the Queen took no pains to conceal her regret for the loss of Silesia. At the sight of a Silesian, as the English Ambassador, Robinson, wrote to his Court, she would forget the Queen, and burst into tears like a woman.[1] Frederick's jealousy was further increased by a treaty, concluded December 20th, 1743, at Vienna, between Austria and Saxony, containing a renewed guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, without any exception with regard to Silesia; as well as by another entered into at St. Petersburg, February 4th, 1744, between the King of Poland and the Empress of Russia, by which the Alliance of 1733 was renewed with some modifications.[2] Besides these grounds for apprehension, Frederick was also of opinion that the Queen of Hungary was pushing matters too far against Charles VII. by aiming to deprive him of the Imperial Crown. Against the League of Austria, Great Britain, Russia, Saxony, Sardinia, and the States-General, he therefore resolved to oppose a double league, one with France and one with the States of the Empire.

The Secret Treaty with France was signed June 5th, 1744, but had probably been arranged some time before. The Cabinet of Versailles seems to have entered into it with a view to divert the Austrians from their attack by engaging the King of Prussia in a war with them, and encouraging him to invade Bohemia; of which Kingdom, after its conquest, Frederick was to retain certain districts.[3] The alliance with the Emperor Charles VII. seems to have been designed by Frederick to give a colourable pretence to his attack upon Bohemia. This alliance, known by the name of the UNION OF FRANKFORT, was signed by the Emperor, the King of Prussia, the Elector Palatine, and the King of Sweden, as Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, May 22nd, 1744. Its professed objects were, to maintain the German Constitution, to compel the Court of Vienna to recognize Charles VII. as Emperor, and restore to him his Bavarian dominions. By separate articles, and by a further

[1] Raumer, *Friedrich II.* S. 160. [2] Martens, *Supplément au Recueil*, t. iii. p. 15.
[3] Garden, t. iii. p. 311.

secret treaty between the Emperor and the King of Prussia alone, signed July 24th, Bohemia, after its conquest, was to be made over to the Emperor and his heirs; in return for which Charles was to cede Silesia to Prussia, together with the three circles of Bohemia nearest to that Province, namely, Königsgrätz, Buntzlau, and Leitmeritz, with some other places. Frederick also guaranteed to the Emperor Upper Austria, so soon as he should have conquered it. France acceded to both these treaties.[1]

Early in August Frederick himself communicated the Union of Frankfort to the Court of Vienna, and declared that, as a member of the Empire, he could not evade his duty of providing a contingent of auxiliary troops for the service of the Emperor, but that in other respects he should observe all his engagements with the Queen of Hungary. In the course of that month he commenced what has been called the Second Silesian War by marching 80,000 men into Bohemia. The army advanced in three columns. One, led by the King in person, passed through Saxony, regardless of the protests of the Court of Dresden; another, under Leopold of Dessau, took the route of Lusatia; while the third, under Field-Marshal Schmettau, debouching from Silesia and Glatz, entered Bohemia by Braunau. The united columns marched upon Prague, which surrendered, after a siege of six days, September 16th. Frederick, ignorant of the strong alliance between the King of Poland and the Court of Vienna, had hoped to gain Augustus, and made some tempting offers to him and his minister, Brühl. Augustus, however, ordered his army, 24,000 men strong, to enter Bohemia; nor could Frederick prevent their junction at Eger with Charles of Lorraine and the Austrian army retiring from Alsace. Neither the French under Noailles, nor the Imperialists under Seckendorf, who was suspected of having sold himself to the Court of Vienna, had attempted to arrest the march of the Austrians through Suabia, Franconia, and Bavaria. After their junction at Eger the Austrian and Saxon forces amounted to 90,000 men. The King of Prussia had but small prospect of successfully opposing them; especially as the Bohemian population, mostly Catholics, were inimical to the Prussians, instead of assisting them, like the Silesians. Frederick, therefore, determined to retreat. Leaving a garrison of 10,000 men at Prague, he crossed the Elbe at Kolin, November 9th, and gained the County of Glatz with rapid marches. The Prussian garrison was

[1] Rousset, t. xviii. p. 446; Wenck, t. ii. p. 163. The Treaty of Union and separate article, are in the appendix to Garden's third volume.

also compelled to evacuate Prague, and arrived at Friedland with great loss.

Frederick seems rather to have outwitted himself on this occasion. France obtained her ends by procuring the withdrawal of the Austrian army from Alsace; but the French did nothing to assist Frederick, though they made some fine promises, of which he now knew the value, *for next spring*. This was, however, a game of which *he* was little entitled to complain. The French, in turn, had their suspicions of him, and were apprehensive that he might desert them, and again negotiate with Maria Theresa, as he had done in 1742.[1] Such mutual distrust is the necessary penalty of *finesse*. To avenge Frederick's unlucky attempt upon Bohemia, the Austrians under Nadasti, and the Hungarians under Counts Palfy, Esterhazy, and Caroli—for another Hungarian "insurrection" had taken place in favour of Maria Theresa—broke into Upper Silesia and the County of Glatz, from which, with the exception of the towns of Neisse, Kosel, and Glatz, they totally expelled the Prussians before the end of 1744. In a proclamation, issued December 4th, it was notified that the whole Silesian territory had returned under the dominion of the Queen of Hungary. But the assumption was premature. Old Prince Leopold of Anhalt-Dessau, to whom Frederick committed the task, succeeded in nearly clearing Silesia of the Austrians before the following spring. Meanwhile the French, instead of succouring Frederick, had employed themselves in taking Freiburg in the Breisgau, which surrendered November 5th. The Prussian attack upon Bohemia had also proved of service to the Emperor by withdrawing a great part of the Austrian troops from his Electorate in order to repel it. Seckendorf, assisted by some French troops, took advantage of this circumstance to drive out the remainder. Munich was recovered, October 16th, and Charles VII. was enabled once more to return to his capital.

The Italian campaign of 1744 was unfavourable to the Austrians. In the preceding year, they had, as we have seen, driven the Spaniards almost to the Neapolitan frontier, and, in spite of the neutrality imposed upon it, seemed to threaten an invasion of that Kingdom. To avert it, Don Carlos, after taking all possible precautions against an attack upon his capital from the sea, joined the Spaniards with his forces, and enabled them to drive the Austrians and Piedmontese out of the Papal territories.

The invasion of Bohemia by the Prussians produced what has

[1] Adelung, *Staatsgeschichte*, B. iv. S. 181.

been called the Quadruple Alliance, established by the Treaty of Warsaw, January 8th, 1745, between the King of Poland as Elector of Saxony, Great Britain, the Queen of Hungary, and the States-General. The Elector renewed his guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, and promised to operate immediately in Bohemia with 30,000 auxiliary troops. So long as this army should be required Great Britain was to pay an annual subsidy of 100,000*l.*, and the United Provinces 50,000*l.* Poland and Russia were to be invited to accede to the alliance. By some separate and secret articles Augustus III. engaged, not indeed directly, but in effect, to procure the Imperial Crown for the Grand Duke of Tuscany; while the King of England and the Queen of Hungary promised to assist Augustus in his salutary views with regard to Poland, so far as could be done without violating its Constitution; that is, in other words, to assure the Succession to his son.[1]

Soon after the execution of this treaty an unexpected event changed the face of affairs. The Emperor Charles VII. died January 20th, 1745; an event which virtually annulled the Union of Frankfort. He was succeeded in the Bavarian Electorate by his son, Maximilian Joseph, then only seventeen years of age, and consequently too young to make any pretensions to the Imperial Crown. Maximilian seemed at first inclined to remain faithful to the league with France and Prussia; but the war went so unsuccessfully, and the clamours of his people became so loud in demanding a termination of their miseries, that he listened to the advice of Seckendorf to make peace with the Queen of Hungary at any price. The advance of the Austrians under Bathyani had compelled him to quit Munich soon after his accession, and fly to Augsburg. The French, under Ségur, had also been defeated. Under these circumstances he despatched Prince Fürstenberg to Füssen, where he concluded a peace with the Austrian Count Colloredo, April 22nd, 1745. By this treaty the Queen of Hungary engaged to re-establish the Elector in all his dominions, and recognized the Imperial dignity of his father. The Elector, on his side, renounced for himself and his heirs all claims to the Austrian inheritance, acceded to the guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction given by the Empire, engaged to observe a strict neutrality, supported the vote of Bohemia in the Imperial election, and promised his own for the Grand Duke of Tuscany.[2]

[1] Wenck, t. ii. p. 171; Rousset, *Recueil*, t. xviii. p. 516.

[2] Wenck, t. ii. p. 180; Menzel, B. v. S. 317. Frederick sums up the results as follows: "The Emperor dies; his son makes peace with the Queen of Hungary; the Grand Duke is to be Emperor; the Treaty of Warsaw leagues half Europe

The objects of the Quadruple Alliance of Warsaw were more clearly announced in a secret treaty between Austria and Saxony, concluded at Leipsic, May 18th, 1745. Silesia was to be recovered for the Queen, Prussia was to be confined in narrower bounds than before the conquest of that Province, and reduced to a state in which she should no longer be dangerous to the two allied Powers. In case of the entire success of their arms, the Duchy of Magdeburg, with the Circle of the Saal, the principality of Crossen, with the district of Züllichau, the Bohemian fiefs in Lusatia belonging to the House of Brandenburg, and the circle of Schwiebus, were to be assigned to the Elector of Saxony; from which apportionment deductions were to be made in proportion as the war with Prussia might prove less successful.[1]

While nearly all the Powers of Christendom were thus leagued in hostile treaties and engaged in mutual slaughter, there was one Power, standing without the pale, which took no part in their contests, and even endeavoured to reconcile them. Engrossed by their own interests, and confident in their power to repel all attacks from without, the Turks concerned not themselves about the maintenance of the political balance in Europe; an indifference also encouraged by their religion, which forbids them to take too direct a part in the affairs of Christians, or to go to war with any friendly Power except in case of a formal violation of treaties.[2] It seems to have been a whim of the Reis-Effendi Mustapha, Secretary of Legation at Vienna, which prompted him to procure, early in 1745, an offer of mediation to the Christian Powers from the Sublime Porte. Venice was proposed as the place of a Congress; and, as preliminaries, an armistice on the footing of *uti possidetis*, on condition that the election of Emperor should take place only by a unanimity of votes. Such a condition, which would make the election depend on the King of Prussia, could not, of course, be accepted by the Court of Vienna. The intervention of the Sultan affected to be religious as well as political. He proposed that, if the Pontiff of the Christians would send one of his *apostles* to deliver his pacific exhortations to the Congress, he, on his side, would despatch a *dervise* selected by the Mufti. Perhaps, however, the real motive of the Porte for this unheard-of proceeding was the damage suffered by the Turkish commerce through the

against Prussia; Prussian money keeps Russia inactive; England begins to incline towards Prussia."—*Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. x. *sub fin.*

[1] Stenzel, *Gesch. Preussens*, Th. iv. p. 239.

[2] Vergennes, *Mémoire sur la Porte Ottomane*, published in *Politique de tous les Cabinets de l'Europe*, t. iii. p. 142 (2nd ed. Paris, 1801).

quarrels of the Christians.[1] The proffered mediation was respectfully declined by the larger States, though some of the smaller ones, as Naples and Venice, were in favour of it.

The King of Prussia, having no other ally but France, on whose loyal support he could not reckon, remained on the defensive in the campaign of 1745. He entrenched himself in the neighbourhood of Frankenstein and Neisse, at Jauernik, not far from Schweidnitz, and there awaited the approach of the Austrians and Saxons. Prince Charles, who commanded them, advanced by Landshut into the plains of Hohenfriedberg, where he was unexpectedly attacked and defeated by Frederick, near Striegau (June 4th). After the battle of Striegau, or Hohenfriedberg, Charles retreated into Bohemia, followed by the Prussians; but the advantageous position occupied by the Austrians near Königsgrätz, as well as the necessity which Frederick was under of maintaining his communications with Silesia, prevented his deriving any solid advantages from his decisive victory, and penetrating further into Bohemia. Towards the end of September he took up a very strong position near Sorr with 25,000 men. Here he was attacked by the Austrians with much larger forces, September 30th; but the inequality of the ground deprived them of the advantage of their numerical superiority, and Frederick gained a complete victory.

Meanwhile negotiations had been entered into at London to re-establish a peace between the Queen of Hungary and the King of Prussia. Carteret (now Lord Granville) had retired from the English Ministry, and had been succeeded by the Earl of Harrington, a man of more moderate views. The events of the year 1745 had made the English Cabinet very desirous to bring about a peace between Frederick and Maria Theresa. The success of the French arms in Flanders, consequent on their victory at Fontenoy, to be related presently, and the descent of the young Pretender in Scotland in July—an event in our domestic history, the well-known circumstances of which we need not detail—by compelling the withdrawal of some of the British forces from the Netherlands, rendered it desirable that the Queen of Hungary should be at liberty to act with greater vigour towards the Rhine. A secret treaty with the King of Prussia had been signed at Hanover, August 26th. Peace was to be concluded within six weeks between Prussia and Austria on the basis of that of Breslau; Augustus was to make a separate act of cession of Silesia to Frederick, who was to give his vote in the approaching election at

[1] See Flassan, *Dipl. Française*, t. v. p. 252; Hammer, *Osm. Gesch.* B. viii. S. 59.

Frankfort for the Grand Duke Francis as Emperor. The English Cabinet had had great difficulty to bring Frederick to these terms, yet the Queen of Hungary would not listen to them. She was already sure of her husband's election, and she was unwilling to abandon the hope of recovering Silesia, on which she had set her heart. The expectation, however, that something might eventually be concluded, had prevented Frederick from pursuing his victory at Sorr. But a piece of intelligence, which he obtained through the indiscretion of the King of Poland's Minister, Count Brühl, transmitted to him through the Swedish Minister, at the Court of Dresden, induced him to take more vigorous steps.[1] The Queen of Hungary had formed the project of detaching 10,000 men from the army of the Rhine who, in conjunction with the Saxons, were to march upon Berlin; while Prince Charles of Lorraine was to enter Silesia with another army and attack the King of Prussia in his winter quarters. Frederick resolved to anticipate and divert this project by invading Saxony. Towards the end of November he entered Lusatia with his army, and after subduing that Province marched upon Dresden. Augustus, who had refused Frederick's offer to treat separately, fled to Prague; while Prince Leopold of Dessau, entering Saxony by way of Halle, took Leipsic and Meissen, and established communications with Frederick. Prince Charles now marched to the defence of Dresden; but before he could join the Saxon army it had been defeated by Prince Leopold at Kesselsdorf, December 15th. The remnants of it escaped to Prince Charles, who, in the face of Frederick's now much superior forces, found it prudent to retreat into Bohemia. Dresden surrendered unconditionally to the King of Prussia, December 18th, and all Saxony was laid under contribution.

Maria Theresa was now compelled to listen to the appeals of the King of Poland, as well as to the British Cabinet, which threatened to withdraw its subsidies unless she made peace with Prussia. Frederick himself was desirous of peace, but only on the basis of that of Breslau. His money was almost exhausted, he could not rely upon the proffered help of France, he felt himself unequal to another campaign, and was indeed content with what he had achieved. Two treaties were signed at Dresden on the same day (December 25th, 1745) with Saxony and Austria. By the first Augustus recovered what he had lost during the war, but Saxony had to pay a million dollars, besides the contributions levied.

[1] *Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. xiii.

The Queen of Poland, daughter of Joseph I., renounced all her claims to the territories ceded to Prussia by the Peace of Breslau. In the treaty with Austria, Maria Theresa again renounced Silesia and the County of Glatz, the cession of which was guaranteed by England. Frederick, as Elector of Brandenburg, allowed the electoral vote of Bohemia, and adhered to the election of Maria Theresa's consort as Emperor, against which he and the Elector Palatine had at first protested.[1] The Grand Duke had been elected at Frankfort, September 13th, and crowned October 4th, with the title of Francis I. Austria had regained the ecclesiastical Electors, and could, of course, reckon on Bavaria, Hanover, and Saxony. France had endeavoured to incite Augustus to become a candidate for the Imperial Crown, but without effect. Thus the Empire fell to the New House of Austria, that of Habsburg-Lorraine, and France missed the principal object for which she had gone to war. The Prussians evacuated Saxony within twelve days after the signing of the treaties. A little before, East Friesland, the reversion to which, it will be remembered, had been assigned by the Emperor Leopold to the Elector Frederick III., in compensation of the cession of Schwiebus, fell to the King of Prussia by the death of the last Prince, Charles Edward, May 25th, 1744.[2]

Meanwhile in Flanders the French had achieved some brilliant success, especially at the Battle of Fontenoy, gained by Marshal Saxe over the Duke of Cumberland and Field-Marshal Königseck (May 11th, 1745), who were endeavouring to relieve Tournai. Louis XV. and the Dauphin were present at this affair. It was followed by the capture of Tournai, Ghent, Bruges, Oudenarde, Nieuport, Ath. Little was done on the side of the Rhine. The Prince of Conti passed that river and the Main, to threaten Frankfort and prevent the election of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and the Pragmatic Army was compelled to retire beyond the Lahn; and after it had formed a junction with the Austrians under the Grand Duke, the French in turn were forced to retreat and recross the Rhine. The campaign in Italy this year had also been productive of events of more than ordinary importance. In the spring the Spaniards, under Gages, dislodged Lobkowitz and the Austrians from the Legation of Bologna, and pursued them into the Modenese. At the same time was negotiated the Treaty of Aranjuez, between France, Spain, Naples, and the Republic of

[1] Wenck, t. ii. p. 194 sqq.
[2] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 321.

Genoa (May 7th, 1745). The object of it was to gain over the Genoese, in order that Spain, besides what assistance the Republic could afford, might obtain the advantage of sending her armies into Italy by way of Genoa. The Genoese, who had been disgusted by the Treaty of Worms, agreed to aid the contracting parties with troops, &c.; in return for which some places were to be added to their dominions; their privileges and possessions, including Corsica, were to be guaranteed; and, after the peace, the Republic was to enjoy the same "royal distinction" as Venice, with regard to the ceremonial of ambassadors, &c.[1] The Infant Don Philip and Marshal Maillebois arrived at Savona with their forces towards the end of June, when the Genoese declared war against the King of Sardinia. Gages now crossed the Apennines, amidst the greatest difficulties and hardships, to Sarzana, and established his camp at Langasto, near Genoa; when, being reinforced by 10,000 Genoese, he passed the Bochetta, and joined Don Philip and Maillebois at Acqui. The combined army amounted to near 70,000 men. The King of Sardinia and Schulenburg, who had succeeded Lobkowitz in the command of the Austrians, now retired to Bassignano, and the combined army successively took Tortona, Piacenza, Parma, and Pavia (August and September). Schulenburg having separated from the King in order to cover Milan, Gages attacked and defeated Charles Emanuel in his camp at Bassignano, September 28th. Alexandria, Asti, Casale, successively surrendered to the Spaniards, who spread themselves through Lombardy. The Infant entered Milan, December 19th.

These disasters caused Charles Emanuel to desire peace; and the Court of Versailles, alarmed at the negotiations between Austria and Prussia, was disposed to grant liberal terms in order to withdraw him from the Austrian alliance. The minister, D'Argenson, had formed one of those magnificent schemes of which the heads of French statesmen are so prolific. Italy was to be organized into a Confederation, with a permanent Diet like Germany; the Austrians were to be expelled, and all the Italian States liberated from any bonds of vassalage towards the Holy Roman Empire; France was disinterestedly to renounce any pretensions she might have to hold anything on the other side of the Alps; the foreign princes established in Italy were to be *Italianized* by being disabled from possessing any dominions out of the Peninsula: such were the main outlines of this grand scheme.[2] The King of Sardinia, unfortu-

[1] Garden, t. iii. p. 325.
[2] D'Argenson, *Mémoires*, ap. Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xv. p. 292.

nately, was not up to the level of these "ideas;" he seems to have regarded with distrust the French propositions, although they did not even claim Savoy, a French Province by language; but he had some uneasy recollections of the war of 1733. However, as the share allotted to himself was very considerable, including a large part of the Milanese, he signed the preliminaries of a treaty, December 26th, 1745.[1] The Court of Madrid, to which the negotiations had not been communicated till the preliminaries were laid before it for acceptance, naturally felt very indignant at what it regarded as a treachery on the part of France;[2] especially as it knew that Louis XV. had also entered into secret negotiations with the Dutch. The reluctance of the Queen of Spain to accede to the treaty produced a delay of which Maria Theresa availed herself to send 30,000 men into Italy, who had been released through the peace with Prussia. The Austrians, now under Prince Lichtenstein, thus obtained so great a numerical superiority in that country, that Charles Emanuel resolved to break off his secret intelligence with France.

In the campaign in Flanders in 1746 the French followed up the successes which they had achieved in the previous year. Brussels, Antwerp, Mons, Charleroi, Namur, and other places, successively surrendered to Marshal Saxe and the Prince of Conti. After the capture of Namur in September, Marshal Saxe, reuniting all the French forces, attacked Prince Charles of Lorraine at Raucoux, between Liége and Viset, and completely defeated him, October 11th; after which both sides went into winter quarters. All the country between the Meuse and the sea was now in the power of France, Austria retaining only Luxembourg and Limburg. It was, however, some drawback to French vanity that these successes had been chiefly obtained for them by two foreigners, Marshal Saxe and his principal lieutenant, Count Löwendahl, a Dane, who had learnt the art of war under Münnich. The Court of Versailles, afraid that the Elector of Saxony would sell his troops to Great Britain, bought his neutrality for three years for two million francs per annum. The marriage of the Dauphin, father of Louis XVI., to a daughter of Augustus III., was a result of this connection (December, 1746).

In Italy, Charles Emanuel, as we have said, renouncing the French alliance, seized Asti, March 8th. Don Philip quitted Milan and retired to Pavia. The Austrian commander, Lichtenstein, and

[1] The conditions will be found in Garden, t. iii. p. 349 sq.
[2] *Mémoires de Noailles*, t. vi. p. 176.

the King of Sardinia gained a signal victory over Maillebois and Gages near Piacenza, June 16th, which ultimately compelled the French and Spaniards to relinquish all their conquests, and recross the Alps. But another event of greater importance contributed to produce this result—the sudden death of Philip V. of Spain, July 9th. Philip, in spite of his wars of ambition, had left Spain in a better condition than he found it. He had particularly encouraged literature and art. In his reign were founded the royal library, open to public use, the academy for the Spanish language, the academy of S. Fernando for painting and sculpture, and the academy of history.[1] His successor, Ferdinand VI., then in his thirty-fourth year, being Philip's second son by his first wife, Maria Louisa of Savoy, was not interested in the ambitious projects of his father's widow, Elizabeth Farnese, and one of his first steps was to recall his forces from Italy. Yet he treated his stepmother, who had never discovered for him any feeling but aversion, with great liberality, allowing her to retain the Palace of St. Ildefonso, and, contrary to the practice of his predecessors, even permitted her to reside at Madrid. He showed an equal affection for his stepbrothers, and promised to promote their interests.[2] The withdrawal of the Spanish forces from Italy was, however, too precipitate, as it abandoned the Genoese to the Austrians. Gages was superseded in the command of the Spaniards by Las Minas, who had orders immediately to retreat to Nice; Maillebois and the French were compelled to accompany him; the combined army retired with precipitation along the coast of Liguria, pursued and harassed by the Austrians and Piedmontese; it did not even halt at Nice, but crossed the Var, September 17th, 1746. Genoa, bombarded by an English fleet, opened her gates to the Austrians, and submitted to hard conditions. The Doge and six senators proceeded to Vienna to implore Maria Theresa's mercy. After the capture of Genoa, the King of Sardinia and Lichtenstein, with 40,000 Austrians and Piedmontese, passed the Var and invested Antibes, which was also bombarded by an English squadron; and Belle-Isle, who had succeeded Maillebois in the command of the French, retreated before them to within a few miles of Toulon. But Provence was delivered from its invaders by a sudden revolution. General Botta and the Austrians in possession of Genoa treated the inhabitants in a tyrannical and revolting manner, not only exacting the most oppressive imposts, but also insulting and maltreating the citizens. These brutalities at length excited a

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iii. ch. xlvii. [2] *Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 2.

spirit of resistance. Some Austrian soldiers having endeavoured to harness the passengers in the streets to a mortar they were carrying off, the people rose against them, and after five days of street fighting, the Austrian general was compelled to retire with a loss of 5,000 men (December 10th).[1] The Imperialists being thus deprived of the supplies which they drew from Genoa, and menaced by the approach of Belle-Isle, who had been reinforced, abandoned the siege of Antibes, and retired into Italy, January, 1747. After the formal declarations between France and England in 1743, hostilities had extended to the colonial possessions of those nations. In 1745 the people of New England volunteered to reduce Louisbourg, the capital of Cape Breton; and having, with the assistance of a squadron under Commodore Warren, effected that object, the whole island submitted. In the following year the French fitted out a very formidable fleet, with a great quantity of transports, to recover that colony, which arrived on the American coast in September, 1746. But the enterprise proved entirely abortive, without a single action having been fought. The land forces, decimated by sickness, were conveyed back to France, the fleet was dispersed and disabled by violent storms, and the remnant of it compelled to take refuge at Quebec. In the same year the English Ministry had organized at Portsmouth an expedition against Canada; but having been delayed till the season of action was past, it was employed in making a descent on the French coast, at Port L'Orient; which, however, proved a complete failure. The French were more fortunate in the East, where, as already mentioned, they captured Madras.

Ever since the year 1745 some negotiations had been going on between France and the Dutch for the re-establishment of peace. The States-General had proposed the assembling of a Congress to the Cabinet of Vienna, but without success. In September, 1746, conferences were opened at Breda, between France, Great Britain, and the States-General; but as Great Britain had gained some advantages at sea, the negotiations were protracted, and the Cabinets of London and Vienna endeavoured to induce the Dutch to take a more direct and active part in the war. In this state of things the Court of Versailles took a sudden resolution to coerce the States-General. A manifest was published by Louis XV., April 17th, 1747, filled with those pretexts which it is easy to find on such occasions: not, indeed, exactly declaring war against the Dutch Republic, but that he should enter her territories "without

[1] For the affairs of Genoa, see Häderlin, *Nachricht von der Republik Genua.*

breaking with her;" that he should hold in deposit the places he might occupy, and restore them as soon as the States ceased to succour his enemies.[1] Count Löwendahl then entered Dutch Flanders by Bruges, and seized, in less than a month, Sluis, Ysendyke, Sas de Gand, Hulst, Axel, and other places.

Holland had now very much declined from the position she had held a century before. There were indeed many large capitalists in the United Provinces, whose wealth had been amassed during the period of the Republic's commercial prosperity, but the State, as a whole, was impoverished and steeped in debt. The national debt, including that of the separate provinces, amounted to upwards of eighty millions sterling; yet, so abundant was money, that the interest paid on it was only at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and the Dutch citizens are computed to have had an almost equal amount, or near seventy millions, invested in the English, French, Austrian, Saxon, Danish, and even Russian funds.[2] But in thus becoming the capitalists and money-lenders of Europe, they had ceased to be her brokers and carriers. The excessive taxes, by raising the prices of necessaries, and consequently of labour, had disabled her manufacturers and ship-owners from competing with foreigners. Holland was no longer the *entrepôt* of nations. The English, the Swedes, the Danes, and the Hamburghers had appropriated the greater part of her trade. Such was the result of the long wars in which she had been engaged: a great part of which had, indeed, been incurred for self-preservation, or in the interests of her commerce, though some of them must be attributed to the ambition of playing a prominent part in the affairs of Europe. Her political consideration had dwindled equally with her commerce. Instead of pretending, as formerly, to be the arbiter of nations, she had become little more than the satellite of Great Britain;[3] a position forced upon her by fear of France, and her anxiety to maintain her barriers against that encroaching Power. Since the death of William III., the Republican, or aristocratic party had again seized the ascendency. William III.'s collateral heir, John William Friso, had not been recognized as Stadholder, and the Republic was again governed, as in the time of De Witt, by a Grand Pensionary and *greffier*.

[1] Martin, t. xv. p. 316.

[2] See Raynal, *Hist. Philosophique des deux Indes*, liv. xii. (vol. iv. p. 75 sqq., Justamond's Transl., London, 1776). The Abbé Raynal wrote near the time of which we are speaking.

[3] Frederick the Great says of her, in his view of Europe: "A la suite de l'Angleterre se range la Hollande, comme une chaloupe qui suit l'impression d'un vaisseau de guerre auquel elle est attachée."

The dominant party had, however, become highly unpopular. It had sacrificed the army to maintain the fleet, and the Republic seemed to lie at the mercy of France. At the approach of the French, consternation reigned in the provinces. The Orange Party raised its head, and demanded the re-establishment of the Stadholdership. The town of Veere, in Zealand, gave the example of insurrection, and William IV., of Nassau-Dietz, who was already Stadholder of Friesland, Groningen, and Gelderland, was eventually proclaimed hereditary Stadholder, Captain-General and Admiral of the United Provinces. William IV. was the son of John William Friso, and son-in-law of George II., whose daughter, Anne, he had married. The French threatening Maestricht, the allies, under the Duke of Cumberland, marched to Lawfeld in order to protect it. Here they were attacked by Marshal Saxe, July 2nd, 1747, and after a bloody battle compelled to recross the Meuse. The Duke of Cumberland, however, took up a position which prevented the French from investing Maestricht. On the other hand, Löwendahl carried Bergen-op-Zoom by assault, July 16th. These reverses of the allies were in some degree compensated by Anson's victory over the French fleet off Cape Finisterre, June 14th, and that of Admiral Hawke, near the Isle of Aix, October 14th. These and other battles ruined the French navy.

The Austrians, who had been exceedingly irritated by the loss of Genoa, resolved this year to attempt its recovery. In a manifest, breathing a spirit of vindictiveness and injustice, published March 29th, 1747, the Genoese were declared rebels, and subject to all the penalties of treason; and their property, wherever found, was to be confiscated.[1] The Austrian general, Schulenburg, master of the Bocchetta, pressed hardly upon the town; but the French garrison under the Duke de Boufflers, son of the celebrated marshal, made a vigorous resistance, and on the approach of Belle-Isle and Las Minas with the French and Spanish forces, who had occupied the County of Nice, early in June, the Austrians were compelled to raise the blockade and retire. The Spaniards had now again begun to co-operate with the French, and were making more vigorous preparations. Although Ferdinand, at his accession, had assured Louis XV. of his resolution to maintain the engagements contracted by his father, yet he had not only, as we have seen, withdrawn his troops from Italy, but had also entered into negotiations with the British Cabinet,

[1] Haymann's *Archiv* ap. Garden, t. iii.

through the mediation of Portugal, and some steps towards a pacification had actually been taken.[1] But the influence of the Queen Dowager and the policy of the party which favoured an establishment for Don Philip in Italy, now regarded almost a point of national honour, ultimately prevailed; and, as it was thought that the British Cabinet leaned too much to the side of Maria Theresa, Spain again threw in her weight with France.

The campaign of 1747 not having been fortunate for the Austrian alliance, it was resolved to make a grand effort in the following year. Great Britain, the Empress-Queen, the King of Sardinia, and the States-General, signed a Convention at the Hague, January 26th, 1748, by which they agreed to bring into the field an army of 192,000 men. Great Britain and the States were each to contribute 66,000 men, and Maria Theresa 60,000. The Dutch also engaged to add ten or twelve vessels to the English fleet, which "was destined to ruin the commerce of France and protect that of the two nations." (Art. vii.) Maria Theresa was to keep in Italy 60,000 effective troops, and the King of Sardinia 30,000. The latter Monarch also engaged to add his galleys to the English fleet of thirty ships of war. To support these armaments Great Britain engaged to pay a subsidy of 400,000*l.* to Austria, and another of 300,000*l.* to Sardinia.[2] In the preceding June a treaty had also been concluded between Great Britain and Russia, by which the latter Power, in consideration of a subsidy of 100,000*l.* sterling per annum, undertook to keep 30,000 infantry on the frontiers of Livonia, besides fifty vessels on the coast, in readiness to act on the first requisition of the English Cabinet.[3] By another treaty, in November, in which Holland joined, the force to be provided by Russia was raised to 37,000 foot. These treaties had considerable influence in inclining France to peace.

Negotiations had been going on throughout the winter, and a Congress met at Aix-la-Chapelle, April 24th, 1748. Most of the belligerent Powers were desirous of peace. Great Britain and Holland were weary of the war; France and Spain were almost exhausted. Louis XV.'s new mistress, Madame de Pompadour, also pressed for peace, because she did not like him to be absent with the army several months in the year. In order to stimulate the negotiations, the French had invested Maestricht, April 13th. Marshal Saxe had remarked to Louis, "Sire, the peace must be

[1] On the motion of Mr. Walpole, the British Parliament repealed the Act prohibiting commerce with Spain. Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 9.

[2] Wenck, t. ii. p. 410.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 244; Rousset, *Recueil*, t. xix. p. 492.

conquered at Maestricht." The taking of that place would, indeed, have opened Holland to the French, and they had commenced the siege in the face of the allies 80,000 strong. On the other hand, the advance of the Russians, under Prince Repnin, towards the Rhine, through Poland, Moravia, and Bohemia, also tended to accelerate a peace. This was the second time that a Russian army had appeared in Germany. Meanwhile, however, as Austria, in whose behalf the war had been undertaken, seemed not to the Maritime Powers to exert herself in proportion to her interest in it, they had, in a secret conference, signed separate preliminaries with France, April 30th. The principal articles were:—Restitution of all conquests made during the war, which involved the restitution of Cape Breton to France, Madras to England, and to the Dutch the barrier towns conquered by the French; the Duchies of Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla to be assigned to Don Philip, on condition of their being restored to the actual possessor if Don Carlos should mount the throne of Spain, or if Don Philip should die without heirs; the Republic of Genoa and the Duke of Modena to be restored to their former positions: Sardinia to hold what had been ceded to her in 1743; the *Asiento* contract and annual vessel to be renewed to Great Britain, as well as the article in the Treaty of 1718, respecting the succession to the throne of that Kingdom; the Emperor Francis to be recognized by all the contracting Powers, and the Pragmatic Sanction to be confirmed; Silesia and the County of Glatz to be guaranteed to Prussia. A suspension of arms was to take place in the Netherlands within six weeks, except with regard to the siege of Maestricht.[1] That place capitulated to the French, May 7th.

Maria Theresa, seeing that the Russians were prepared to come in such force to her aid, was at first unwilling to accede to the peace. She could not digest the loss of the Italian Duchies, for which she had ceded to Sardinia a part of the Milanese. But her minister, Count Kaunitz Rittberg, had formed the plan of recovering Silesia and humbling Prussia through a union with France and Russia; and on these grounds he persuaded his mistress to accept the preliminaries,[2] after protesting against what they might contain prejudicial to her interests (May 25th). The envoys of Sardinia and Modena acceded at the same time; those of Spain and Genoa in June. The definitive Treaty of Aix-la-

[1] Wenck, t. ii. p. 310.
[2] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 321.

Chapelle, embracing the preliminaries already given, was signed by the French, English, and Dutch ministers, October 18th, 1748, and a few days after by those of Spain, Genoa, Modena, and Austria. Sardinia refused to sign because the Treaty of Worms was not guaranteed. No mention was made of the Emperor or Empire, although the Italian Duchies were Imperial fiefs.[1] The Treaty of Madrid, October 5th, 1750, must be regarded as the complement of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Spain had refused to renew the *Asiento*, and to execute the sixteenth article of the treaty, by which the profits of four years, during which the contract had been interrupted by the war, were to be allowed to the parties interested. Both sides armed, and war seemed again inevitable, when, by the treaty mentioned above, Great Britain waived her claims in consideration of the King of Spain paying 100,000*l.* sterling within three months. The trade between the two countries was put on the same favourable footing as in the reign of Charles II. of Spain.[2]

Such was the end of the war of the Austrian Succession, which had lasted eight years. Its object had been to establish four States on the ruins of the House of Austria. But though that House had been deprived of Silesia and the Italian Duchies, these losses were small compared with the danger with which it had at first been threatened; while, on the other hand, it had established the order of succession and still remained a first-rate Power. France, the chief promoter of this bloody and ruinous war, gained literally nothing by it, and increased her debt by 1,200 million livres, or near 50 millions sterling—another seed of the approaching revolution. Her conduct had been neither just nor worthy of a great Power; and, in consequence, she lost her reputation and ceased to be regarded as the arbitress of Europe. The part which England played in the war was conformable to the faith of treaties; though, so far as the continental struggle only is concerned, more chivalrous perhaps than prudent. Yet if she obtained no equivalent for her enormous expenses, she procured compensation for her commercial losses, established her maritime preponderance, and obtained the recognition of the exclusion of the Stuart dynasty. Spain also made some acquisitions in Italy. Russia had, for the first time, interfered with effect in the affairs of Western Europe, and laid the foundation of still more effective intervention. But the most important

[1] The Treaty is in Wenck, t. ii. p. 337; cf. Garden, t. iii. p. 373 sqq.
[2] Wenck, t. ii. p. 464.

consequence of the war was the elevation of Prussia to a first-rate Power. The morality of the conduct by which Frederick II. achieved this result will hardly bear a strict scrutiny. So long as he attained his ends he was little scrupulous about the means. He affected friendship for Maria Theresa at the moment when he was preparing to wrest Silesia from her, and that under pretexts which he himself did not consider valid. In pursuit of his object he increased and lowered his demands according to circumstances, and contracted alliances, sometimes under insidious pretences, which were repudiated directly his interest required it: conduct in which he has been only too well imitated by some of his successors. If it be possible to justify theso proceedings by the "reason of State," on which he laid so much stress, let us not at least debase our judgment by also according to them a moral sanction. In the absence of any last appeal between nations but force, we can ill afford to corrupt and weaken the influence of the only other and already but too feeble check upon ambition and violence—that of public opinion. In some eyes, however, success will be Frederick's great justification; and it is certain that he increased the Prussian dominions by a third.

CHAPTER XLVII.

THE seven years which succeeded the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle are described by Voltaire[1] as among the happiest that Europe ever enjoyed. Commerce revived, the fine arts flourished, and the European nations resembled, it is said, one large family reunited after its dissensions. Unfortunately, however, the Peace had not exterminated all the elements of discord. Scarcely had Europe begun to breathe again when new disputes arose, and the seven years of peace and prosperity were succeeded by another seven of misery and war. The ancient rivalry between France and England, which had formerly vented itself in continental struggles, had, by the progress of maritime discovery and colonization, been extended to every quarter of the globe. The interests of the two nations came into collision in India, Africa, and America, and a dispute about American boundaries again plunged them into war.

By the ninth article of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, France and England were mutually to restore their conquests *in such state as they were before the war*. This clause became a copious source of quarrel. The principal dispute regarded the limits of Acadia, or Nova Scotia, which Province had, by the twelfth article of the Treaty of Utrecht, been ceded to England *conformably to its ancient boundaries;* but what these were had never been accurately determined, and each Power fixed them according to its convenience. Thus, while the French pretended that Nova Scotia embraced only the peninsula extending from Cape St. Mary to Cape Canso, the English further included in it that part of the American continent which extends to Pentagoet on the west, and to the river St. Lawrence on the north, comprising all the Province of New Brunswick.[2] Another dispute regarded the western limits of the British North American settlements. The English claimed the banks of the Ohio as belonging to Virginia, the French as

[1] *Siècle de Louis XV.* ch. xxxi.

[2] These were the boundaries laid down by the French themselves when the Province was restored to them under the name of Acadia. See *Modern Univ. Hist.*

forming part of Louisiana; and they attempted to confine the British colonies by a chain of forts stretching from Louisiana to Canada. Commissaries were appointed to settle these questions, who held their conferences at Paris between the years 1750 and 1755. Disputes also arose respecting the occupation by the French of the islands of St. Lucia, Dominica, St. Vincent, and Tobago, which had been declared neutral by former treaties.

Before the Commissaries could terminate their labours, mutual aggressions had rendered a war inevitable. As is usual in such cases, it is difficult to say who was the first aggressor. Each nation laid the blame on the other. Some French writers assert that the English resorted to hostilities out of jealousy at the increase of the French navy. According to the plans of Rouillé, the French Minister of Marine, 111 ships of the line, fifty-four frigates, and smaller vessels in proportion, were to be built in the course of ten years. The question of boundaries was, however, undoubtedly the occasion, if not also the true cause of the war. A series of desultory conflicts had taken place along the Ohio, and on the frontiers of Nova Scotia, in 1754, without being avowed by the mother countries. A French writer, who flourished about this time, the Abbé Raynal, ascribes this clandestine warfare to the policy of the Court of Versailles, which was seeking gradually to recover what it had lost by treaties.[1] Orders were now issued to the English fleet to attack French vessels wherever found. This act has been censured as piratical, because it had not been preceded by a formal declaration of war; but it was subsequently defended by Pitt, on the ground that the right of hostile operations results not from any such declaration, but from the previous hostilities of an aggressor; nor is this principle contested in the reply of the French Minister.[2] It being known that a considerable French fleet was preparing to sail from Brest and Rochefort for America, Admiral Boscawen was despatched thither, and captured two French men-of-war off Cape Race in Newfoundland, June, 1755. Hostilities were also transferred to the shores of Europe. Sir Edward Hawke was instructed to destroy every French ship he could find between Cape Ortegal and Cape Clear; and the English privateers made numerous prizes.

A naval war between England and France was now unavoidable; but, as in the case of the Austrian Succession, this was also

[1] *Hist. des établissemens des Européens dans les deux Indes* (vol. v. p. 82, Eng. Tr.).

[2] See Pitt's instructions to Mr. Stanley, July 29th, 1761, ap. Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iv. p. 149, and the reply of M. de Bussy, *ibid.* p. 163.

to be mixed up with a European war. The complicated relations of the European system again caused these two wars to run into one, though their origin had nothing in common. France and England, whose quarrel lay in the New World, appeared as the leading Powers in a European contest in which they had only a secondary interest, and decided the fate of Canada on the plains of Germany.

The war in Europe, commonly called the SEVEN YEARS' WAR, was chiefly caused by the pride of one Empress, the vanity of another, and the subserviency of a royal courtesan, who became the tool of these passions. Maria Theresa could not brook the loss of Silesia, especially as it had been inflicted on her by an unequal adversary, whom she despised. Her plans of vengeance were aided by Elizabeth of Russia, whose vanity had been hurt by the impolitic sarcasms of the King of Prussia. But the Empress-Queen would never have been able to execute her projects against Frederick II. unless she had been helped by France. The manner in which she obtained the aid of that Power forms a masterpiece of diplomatic skill.

We have already alluded to the reluctance with which Maria Theresa signed the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Although England had been her most powerful ally, she had begun to regard that Power with aversion, as being, through its counsels, one of the chief causes of her losing Silesia. She was also offended by the high tone assumed by the English Cabinet, and she manifested her discontent to the English Ambassador when he offered to congratulate her on the Peace, by remarking that condolence would be more appropriate.[1] She was aware, however, that a rupture with Great Britain must be made good by an alliance with France, in short, by an inversion of the whole political system of Europe, and the extinction of that hereditary rivalry which had prevailed during two centuries between France and Austria. Such a task presented no ordinary difficulties; yet it was accomplished by the talents and perseverance of Count Kaunitz, one of the most remarkable statesmen of that age, and the greatest minister that Austria ever possessed. Kaunitz was now in the prime of life, having been born in 1711. He had been destined for the Church, but having, through the death of his elder brothers, become heir to the family title and estates, his vocation was altered. After a careful education, completed by foreign travel, he entered the service of Charles VI., and after the death of that Emperor was

[1] Stenzel, *Gesch. des Preuss. Staats*, B. iv. S. 374.

employed by Maria Theresa in various missions to Rome, Florence, Turin, and London, in the discharge of which his abilities procured for him her entire confidence. His success was, perhaps, in no small degree owing to a singular combination of qualities in his character. Under the easy exterior of a man of the world—we might even say of a fop and a voluptuary[1]—were concealed acute penetration, deep reflection, impenetrable reserve, indomitable perseverance. Even his bitter adversary, Frederick II., was forced to acknowledge the depth and power of his intellect. His political principles, like those of most statesmen of the age, were despotic; his residence at Paris had imbued him with the philosophical ideas then current; hence he was indifferent to religion, and regarded the Church only as the servant of the State. The energies of this remarkable man were directed during forty years to one object—the aggrandizement of the House of Austria. While the negotiations at Aix-la-Chapelle were still pending, he had already, as we have said, conceived the seemingly impracticable project of uniting France and Austria against Prussia. The scheme was a profound secret between himself and Maria Theresa. Even the Queen's husband, Francis I., was ignorant of it till it was ripe for execution. The same thing happened at the French Court. Louis XV. and his mistress, the Marquise de Pompadour, formed a sort of interior and secret Cabinet, which often acted contrary to the views of the Ministers. Kaunitz, who, for the purpose of forwarding his plans, filled the post of Austrian Ambassador at Paris from the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle till the year 1753, had observed this peculiarity of the French Court, and availed himself of the facilities which it afforded. To gain Madame de Pompadour was no difficult task. She, too, like the Empress of Russia, had been irritated by some railleries of Frederick's respecting herself and her royal lover. Kaunitz artfully kept his feeling alive, and at the same time soothed the vanity of the royal favourite by the marks of favour and friendship which he persuaded his mistress to bestow upon her. He even prevailed upon the reluctant Maria Theresa, the proud descendant of the House of Habsburg, the chaste mother of a new line of Emperors, to write an autograph letter, in which the Empress-Queen addressed the low-born mistress of Louis as "*Ma Cousine!*"

[1] Thus he could not bear death to be named in his presence. The decease of any of his acquaintance was communicated to him by a circumlocution, as "he will not come again," &c. Marmontel informs us (*Mém.* t. i. p. 339), that he surprised the Count with his face smeared with the yolk of an egg, to remove the effects of the sun after hunting!

After the conquest of Pompadour it was not difficult to gain Louis. That Monarch felt a natural antipathy for Frederick. He envied the Prussian King's splendid talents and achievements; nay, though himself sunk in all the abominations and ordures of the *Parc aux Cerfs*, he affected to abhor Frederick as a Protestant, or rather a freethinker.[1] It was necessary, however, that an alliance between France and Austria should be justified in the eyes of the French nation by some ostensible political object. To provide this, Kaunitz was prepared to sacrifice the Austrian Netherlands. Austria felt that she had been placed there by Great Britain and Holland, two Powers for whom she had no great affection, merely as a stop-gap, and to render those countries a barrier against France; but for that very reason, as well as from their distance, they were felt to be rather a burden than an advantage. Even during the negotiations for the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, Kaunitz had proposed to cede Brabant and Flanders to France, if that Power would compel Frederick to restore Silesia. But France was then exhausted by the recent war, and cared not to enter into the project.[2] It was not till after many years of patient expectation that the breaking out of hostilities between France and England at length promised to crown Kaunitz's labours with success.

The counterpart of that Minister's policy to conciliate France was of course to provoke a quarrel with England. Austria refused to pay the half million crowns which formed her share of the expense of the Dutch garrisons in Austrian Flanders, and abolished the commercial privileges which the English enjoyed in that country. When the British Cabinet remonstrated, the Empress-Queen petulantly replied that she was Sovereign in the Netherlands, and would not be dictated to. Matters grew worse in 1755. France was evidently meditating an invasion of Hanover, and with that view was negotiating with the Elector of Cologne to form magazines in Westphalia. George II. now required of Maria Theresa, as he was entitled to do as guarantor of the Pragmatic Sanction, that she should increase her army in Flanders by 20,000 or 30,000 men. But the Court of Vienna, forgetful of the services which it had received from Great Britain, refused, on the plea that such a step would offend France; alleging also the unfounded excuse that Austria was threatened with invasion by

[1] Martin, t. xv. p. 492.

[2] For these negotiations see *Œuvres de Fréd. II.* t. iv. p. 16; *Mémoires du Maréchal Richelieu*, t. vii. p. 241; Duclos, *Mém. Secrets* (Coll. Michaud et Poujoulat, 3 sér. t. x. p. 635).

Prussia. In vain the English Government assured her that Russia, with whom they had just concluded a treaty, would protect her against any attempt, if such was to be feared, on the part of Frederick. The treaty referred to, executed September 30th, 1755, was but a renewal of the alliance already subsisting between Great Britain and Russia since 1742. The Empress Elizabeth agreed to hold 55,000 men in readiness at the command of England on the frontiers of Livonia, and forty or fifty galleys on the coast, that Power paying 100,000*l.* per annum while the army remained within the Russian boundaries, and 500,000*l.* when it marched beyond them. The invasion of Hanover to be a *casus fœderis*.[1] But the real politics of the Court of St. Petersburg were better known at Vienna than at London. Elizabeth, as the event proved, had only signed this treaty in order to pocket the subsidy which it stipulated, and immediately hostilities broke out she joined Maria Theresa against Great Britain. In fact, a defensive alliance had been concluded at Warsaw between Austria and Russia in June, 1746, and, therefore, after the Peace of Breslau, in a secret article of which Maria Theresa declared that if the King of Prussia should attack either her dominions or those of Russia or Poland, she would revive her rights to Silesia.[2] In her negotiations with Great Britain the Empress-Queen had already begun to throw off the mask. Instead of being defended against Prussia, she openly talked of attacking that Kingdom in order to restore the European balance. Mutual recriminations and reproaches ensued; but George II. declared that he would enter into no paper war, and turned to seek an ally in his nephew, Frederick, who had formerly accused him of deserving the gallows for stealing his father's will!

It was an anxious time for the Prussian King. He wished for nothing more than to preserve what he had already obtained, and was, therefore, sincerely desirous of peace. But he clearly saw that the state of things precluded its maintenance. He was aware that his boldness and bad faith had made him an object of universal suspicion, that Maria Theresa was the centre of all the intrigues against him, and he strongly suspected that one of her trustiest allies might be the Russian Empress Elizabeth. At that period none of the European Courts was honest either to friend or foe. It was a contest of knavery, of bribery of one another's under-secretaries and other officers; each knew the most secret plans of his neighbour. Frederick had long been acquainted with the

[1] Wenck, *Corp. jur. g. rec.* t. iii. p. 75. [2] Adelung, B. v. Beil. ii.

secret article of the Austrian and Russian Treaty of Warsaw, and he felt that it was high time to fortify himself with an alliance. But he was addressed at once by France and England—which should he choose? His treaty with France was just expiring; the Court of Versailles, not yet thoroughly resolved on the grand stroke of an Austrian alliance, wished him to renew it, and to aid in an attack upon Hanover. But the French negotiations were unskilfully managed. Frederick's pride revolted at the haughty tone in which he was treated. He seemed to be regarded almost as a vassal of France; nay, some of the French proposals were positively insulting. Thus, for instance, the French Minister, Rouillé, told the Prussian Ambassador to write to his master that an attack upon Hanover would afford a good opportunity for plunder, as the King of England's treasury was well provided! Frederick, naturally touchy after his somewhat equivocal exploits, indignantly replied to this home-thrust, that he hoped M. Rouillé would learn to distinguish between persons—that such proposals befitted only a contrabandist.[1] The Duke of Nivernais, who was sent on a special embassy to Berlin, tried to tempt Frederick by the offer of Tobago, one of the islands in dispute between France and England. Frederick requested him to find a more fitting Governor "of Barataria." It is probable, however, that in choosing the English alliance, Frederick was guided by policy alone. From a due appreciation of the mercenary motives of the Russian Court, he was of opinion that after all it would adhere to England for the sake of her money; least of all did he expect an event so portentous as an alliance between Austria and France. He, therefore, entered into a Treaty of Neutrality with England, January 16th, 1756, the only object of which professed to be to preserve the peace of Germany, and to prevent foreign troops from entering the Empire. By a secret article, the Netherlands were excluded from the operation of the treaty.[2]

This treaty, apparently so harmless, was followed by important consequences. Kaunitz employed it as his strongest argument to persuade the Cabinet of Versailles to a close alliance with Austria. His plans embraced the partition of Prussia among various Powers; to make the Polish Crown hereditary in the Saxon family; to give the Austrian Netherlands to Don Philip in exchange for Parma and Piacenza; and to assign the ports of Nieuport and Ostend to France. These propositions occasioned violent discussions in the French Cabinet. The greater part of the Ministry was for

[1] *Œuvres*, t. iv. p. 28. [2] Wenck, t. iii. p 84.

adhering to the old French anti-Austrian policy; but Louis and his mistress were for Maria Theresa. This momentous question was debated at a little house belonging to Madame de Pompadour, called Babiole. Madame de Pompadour, and her confidant, the Abbé Bernis, without the intervention of any of the French Ministers, arranged the business with Count Stahremberg, who had succeeded Kaunitz as Austrian Ambassador at Paris. The fate of France—nay, of Europe—lay at the discretion of a vain courtesan. The Austrian alliance was resolved on. On May 1st, 1756, two treaties were executed by France and Austria, one of which stipulated the entire neutrality of the Empress-Queen in the impending war between France and England; by the other, a defensive alliance, the two Powers mutually guaranteed their possessions in Europe, and promised each other a succour of 24,000 men in case of attack—the war with England always excepted on the part of Austria; while France claimed no exceptions, not even in the case of a war between Austria and the Porte. The virtual effect of the treaties, therefore, was that Austria only engaged not to aid England against France, while France engaged to help Austria with 24,000 men against Prussia, in case of need. But by secret articles the obligation of aid became reciprocal if other Powers, even in alliance with England, should attack the European possessions either of France or Austria.[1] Russia subsequently acceded to these treaties.

The wedge was thus got in, and Kaunitz hoped soon to drive it further, and induce the French Court to take a more active part in his project. The negotiations had been concluded without the knowledge of the other Austrian Ministers, or even of the Emperor Francis I., who detested France as the hereditary enemy of the House of Lorraine. When Kaunitz communicated them to the Council, the Emperor became so excited that, striking the table with his fist, he left the room, exclaiming "that such an unnatural alliance should not take place."[2] Kaunitz was so alarmed that he could not say a word; but Maria Theresa directed him to proceed, and manifested such decisive approbation that the other ministers did not venture to oppose him. The easy-tempered Francis, who, in fact, took little part in the affairs of Austria, confining himself to those of the Empire and of his grand duchy of Tuscany, was at length brought to consent to the new line of policy, and even to persuade the States of the Empire to second it.

[1] Wenck, t. iii. p. 139, 141; Garden, t. iv. p. 19.
[2] Coxe, *House of Austria*, vol. iv. ch. cx.

Meanwhile hostilities had openly broken out between France and England. In December, 1755, the Court of Versailles had demanded satisfaction for all vessels seized by the English; which being refused till the reopening of negotiations, an embargo was placed on British vessels in French ports. Great Britain, seeing herself on the eve of a war with France, required from Holland the succours stipulated by the Treaty of 1716; but though this demand was supported by the mother and guardian of the young Stadholder, who was George II.'s daughter, yet the anti-Orange Party, availing itself of the alarm occasioned by a threat of Louis XV., persuaded the States-General to declare a strict neutrality. The English Cabinet had entered into treaties for the hire of troops with the States of Hesse-Cassel, Saxe-Gotha, and Schaumburg-Lippe. These petty German Princes were at that period accustomed to traffic in the blood of their subjects, whose hire went not, like that of the Swiss, into their own pockets, but contributed to support the luxury and profligacy of their Sovereigns. The military force of England was in those days but small; a dislike prevailed of standing armies, and her growing colonies and commerce required that her resources should be chiefly devoted to the augmentation of the navy. Hence the nation was seized almost with a panic when it heard that large armaments, the destination of which was unknown, were preparing at Brest and Havre. The French, to increase the alarm and conceal their real design, caused large bodies of troops to assemble in their channel ports. Troops were hastily brought to England from Hanover and Hesse. But the storm fell elsewhere. War had not yet been formally declared when these armaments, joined by others from the French Mediterranean ports, appeared off Minorca, conveying an army of 12,000 men under Marshal the Duke of Richelieu. The Duke of Newcastle's administration, now tottering to its fall, had neglected the necessary precautions; the garrison of Port Mahon had been reduced to less than 3,000 men; and it was only at the last moment that a fleet of ten ships, under Admiral Byng, was despatched for the defence of Minorca. When Byng arrived, the island was virtually captured. The French had landed in April, 1756; on the 21st they occupied Port Mahon. General Blakeney, who commanded in the absence of Lord Tyrawley, the governor, now retired into the fort of St. Philip, which was deemed impregnable. Byng did not appear off Minorca till May 19th, and on the following day engaged the French fleet in a distant cannonade; after which he retired to Gibraltar, leaving

the island to its fate. The English garrison in St. Philip, despairing of relief, capitulated June 28th, and was conveyed to Gibraltar. Byng was condemned next year by a court-martial of not having done all that lay in his power to succour the place; and as popular clamour rose very high in England at the loss of Minorca, and seemed to demand a victim, he was shot in Portsmouth harbour. After the attack on Minorca, England issued a formal declaration of war against France, May 17th, which was answered by the latter country June 9th.

The continental war had not yet begun. A league was preparing between Austria, Russia, Saxony, and Sweden, among which the spoils of Prussia were to be divided. Silesia and the County of Glatz were to be restored to Austria; Prussia was to be given to Poland, Courland to Russia, Magdeburg to Saxony, Pomerania to Sweden. The Empress Elizabeth of Russia entered ardently into Maria Theresa's plans, but Kaunitz demurred to act without the consent of France. Frederick, who was acquainted with his enemies' schemes, had to determine whether he should await or anticipate the execution of them. He had learnt, to his alarm, that Russia was to begin the war; Austria was to get involved in it, and would then demand the aid of France, under her treaty with that Power. Saxony, as he discovered through Fleming, the Saxon Minister at the Court of Vienna, was to fall upon him when he had been a little shaken in the saddle. It is probable that Kaunitz, who wanted to drive him to some rash step, permitted him to get this secret intelligence.[1] He had, however, also learnt through his friend and admirer, the Grand Duke Peter, who had secretly entered Frederick's service this very year as a Prussian captain, that the Courts of St. Petersburg and Vienna had resolved to attack him, but that the execution of the project had been deferred till the next spring, in order to allow time for Russia to provide the necessary recruits, sailors, and magazines.[2] Frederick armed, and resolved on an immediate invasion of Saxony. First of all, however, by the advice of the English Ambassador, Mitchell, he demanded in a friendly manner, through his Ambassador at Vienna, the object of the Austrian preparations; and as Maria Theresa gave an ambiguous reply to this question, as well as to a demand for a more explicit answer, repeated towards the end of August, 1756, Frederick, after having first published at Berlin a declaration of his motives, set his troops in motion. "It is

[1] Stenzel, B. iv.
[2] Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 131.

better," he wrote to George II., "to anticipate than to be anticipated."[1]

Frederick's conduct on this occasion has been much canvassed. It has been observed that the projects of his enemies were only *eventual*, depending on the condition whether the King of Prussia should give occasion to a war, and, consequently, on his own conduct; that it was very possible their schemes would never have been executed, and problematical whether to await them would have been more dangerous than to anticipate them.[2] Such speculations it is impossible to answer, but it may be observed that the course pursued by Frederick proved ultimately successful; and that, by attacking his enemies before they were prepared, he not only deprived Saxony of the power to injure him, but even pressed the resources of that State into his own service. It must also be remembered that the scanty means of Prussia, in comparison with those of her enemies, did not permit Frederick to keep a large force in the field for a long period of time, and it was, therefore, a point of the most vital importance for him to bring the war to the speediest possible conclusion. The morality of his proceeding may, in this instance, be justified by the necessity of self-defence; for there can be no doubt that a most formidable league had been organized against him.

The Prussians entered Saxony in three columns, towards the end of August, 1756. Prince Ferdinand, of Brunswick, marched with one by way of Halle, Leipsic, and Freiberg, towards Bohemia; the King himself, with Marshal Keith, led another by Torgau and Dresden; the third, under the Prince of Brunswick-Bevern, marched through Lusatia.[3] When Frederick entered

[1] Lord Dover, *Life of Frederick II.* vol. ii. ch. 1.

[2] These reasons were given in a paper read before the Berlin Academy of Sciences by M. von Hertzberg, a few months after Frederick's death. The bad taste of this paper has been remarked upon by Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 425 Anm.; as M. Hertzberg was the very person employed by Frederick thirty years before to draw up the *Mémoire raisonné*, in justification of the step he had taken. See further on this subject, Raumer, *Friedrich II. und seine Zeit.* Abschnitt 28 ff. It may be observed that Frederick's proceeding with regard to Saxony bears a strong analogy to the seizure of the Danish fleet by England in 1807.

[3] It is impossible, in a work like the present, to enter into the details of the Seven Years' War. The principal authorities on the subject are the *Hist. de la guerre de sept ans*, in Frederick's *Œuvres Posthumes;* the *History of the Seven Years' War*, by General Lloyd, with plans (3 vols. 4to.). This work has been translated into German by Tempelhoff, with additions which make it quite a new work (6 vols. 4to.). Archenholz, *Gesch. des siebenjährigen Kriegs* (2 vols. 8vo.); Stuhr, *Forschungen und Erläuterungen über Hauptpunkte der Gesch. des siebenjährigen Kriegs*, Hamburg, 1842. Jomini's *Traité des grandes opérations militaires* contains a critical account of the King of Prussia's campaigns. Napoleon has also criticized all Frederick's military operations in his *Mémoires.*

Dresden, September 7th, he seized the Saxon archives, and caused the despatches, which proved the design of the Powers allied against him to invade and divide Prussia, to be published with the celebrated *Mémoire* of M. von Hertzberg.[1] The Prussians at first pretended to enter Saxony in a friendly manner. They declared that they were only on their way to Bohemia, and should speedily evacuate the country; but they soon began to levy contributions. The King even established a so-called Directory at Torgau, which was to collect the revenues of the electorate; and he caused that town to be fortified. Augustus III. ordered the Saxon army of about 17,000 men, under Rutowski, to take up a strong position near Pirna; but it was without provisions, ammunition, or artillery. Count Brühl had neglected everything, except his own interests and pleasures, and Augustus and he shut themselves up in the impregnable fortress of Königstein. Frederick was unwilling to attack the Saxons. He wished to spare them, and to incorporate them with his own army: and he, therefore, resolved to reduce them by blockade. The delay thus occasioned afforded Maria Theresa time to assemble her forces in Bohemia, under Piccolomini and Brown. As the latter general was hastening to the relief of the Saxons, Frederick marched to oppose him. The hostile armies met on the plain of Lobositz, a little town in the Circle of Leitmeritz, where an indecisive battle was fought, October 1st. The result, however, was in favour of Frederick. He remained master of the field, and the advance of the Austrians was checked. Frederick now hastened back to Saxony, where the troops of Augustus, being reduced to a state of the greatest distress by the exhaustion of their provisions, were compelled to surrender (October 15th), in spite of an attempt of the Austrians to release them. The officers were dismissed on parole, and the greater part of the privates incorporated in Prussian regiments. Augustus III. being permitted to retire into Poland, endeavoured, but without effect, to induce the Poles to embrace his cause. Frederick, who remained master of Saxony, concluded in the winter (January 11th, 1757), a new treaty with Great Britain, the professed object of which was, to balance the "unnatural alliance" between France and Austria. Great Britain was to pay Prussia a subsidy of a million sterling during the war,

[1] *Mémoire raisonné sur les desseins dangereux des cours de Vienne et de Dresde.* See note 2, p. 150. The papers seized, however, do not appear to have afforded any proof against Saxony. See Schlosser, *Gesch. des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, B. ii. S. 306.

to send a fleet into the Baltic, and to harass France on her coasts, or in the Netherlands; while Frederick was to add 20,000 men to the Hanoverian army of 50,000.[1]

Frederick's attack upon Saxony set in motion, in the following year, the powerful league which had been organized against him. The Empress-Queen, the States of the German Empire, France, Russia, and Sweden prepared at once to fall upon him. On the complaint of Augustus, as Elector of Saxony, the German Diet, at the instance of the Emperor Francis, assembled at Ratisbon with more than ordinary promptitude; declared the King of Prussia guilty of a breach of the *Landfriede*, or public peace of the Empire; and decreed, on the 17th of January, 1757, an *armatura ad triplum*, or threefold contingent of troops, and the tax or contribution called *Roman-months*, which would have brought in three million florins, or about 250,000*l.* sterling, could it have been duly levied, for the purpose of restoring Augustus to his dominions. But it was one thing to make these decrees, and another to carry them out. The Prussian envoy at the Diet treated the notary who handed him the decree with the rudest contempt. The North of Germany protested against the decision of the majority of the Diet, and the Sovereigns of Lippe, Waldeck, Hesse-Cassel, Brunswick, Hanover, and Gotha found it more advantageous to let out their troops to England than to pay Roman-months and furnish their contingents to the Imperial army.

France, governed by the small passions of a *boudoir* rather than by the dictates of sound policy, instead of devoting all her energies and resources to the maritime war with Great Britain, resolved to take a principal share in the continental war, and to assist in the abasement of the only German Power capable of making head against Austria. She determined to send three armies into Germany, and exerted her diplomacy to induce Sweden to join the league against Prussia. The revolution which had just taken place in Sweden was favourable to the designs of France. Frederick I., King of Sweden and Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, had died in 1751, and had been succeeded by Adolphus Frederick, of the House of Holstein-Gottorp, elected under Russian influence. Ulrica, sister of the King of Prussia, and consort of Adolphus Frederick, had, in 1756, organized a conspiracy to overthrow the aristocratic faction and restore the royal power; but it ended only in the execution of some of the principal leaders, and the still

[1] The treaty will be found textually in Garden, t. iv. p. 29.

further increase of the power of the *Hats*. This party was sold to France; and the Senate, without even consulting the Estates of the realm, compelled the King to take part against his brother-in-law. The lure held out by France was the recovery, by Sweden, of all her former possessions in Pomerania. In the course of 1757, two conventions were executed between France and Sweden, in which Austria was also included (March 21st and September 22nd). By these treaties, Sweden, as one of the guarantors of the Peace of Westphalia, engaged to maintain in Germany an army of at least 20,000 men, exclusive of the garrison of Stralsund, and of her contingent to the Imperial army for the possessions she still held in Pomerania. Subsidies were to be paid for these succours, and for any increased force. An attempt was also made to induce Denmark to join the league; but the Danish minister, Count Bernstorff, with a high moral feeling which distinguishes him among the politicians of the day, refused to lay the application before his Sovereign, Frederick V., on the ground that nothing more wicked and dreadful can be committed than to enter into an unjust and needless war for the sake of acquiring a piece of territory.[1] A secret treaty was also concluded between the Empress-Queen and Elizabeth of Russia, January 22nd, 1757. Its contents are unknown, and even its existence would have remained a secret but for its being cited in the Convention of St. Petersburg, March 21st, 1760.[2] France also drew closer her alliance with Austria by a fresh treaty, executed on the anniversary of the former one (May 1st, 1757). Between these periods the Court of Versailles had become still more embittered against the King of Prussia. The Dauphin had married a daughter of Augustus III., and her tears and lamentations upon the invasion of Saxony had had a great effect upon Louis XV. Another circumstance had also contributed to his hatred of Frederick. He alone, among all the Princes of Europe, had neglected to condole with the French King, when wounded with the knife of an assassin.

This attempt upon Louis's life had been produced by a fresh persecution of the Jansenists. Christophe de Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris, a violent champion of orthodoxy, had, in 1750, commanded his clergy to refuse the last sacraments to such dying persons as were not provided with a certificate of confession, and refused to acknowledge the bull *Unigenitus*. The withholding of the last sacraments, it should be remembered, implied the refusal

[1] Menzel, B v. S. 449. [2] Garden. t. iv. p. 24.

of Christian sepulture, and affixed a stigma on the deceased and his family. The French Parliament took up the cause of the people against the clergy. Violent scenes ensued. Some of the more prominent presidents and counsellors were banished; the Parliament of Paris was suspended from its functions; but a passive resistance continued, and, in 1754, the King found it expedient to settle the matter by a transaction. The Bishops consented to dispense with the obnoxious certificates, provided the clergy were released from the tax of a twentieth, which the Government, in a new scheme of finance, had extended to the incomes of that order; and the Parliament of Paris was restored, amid the acclamations of the people, on agreeing to register a Royal Declaration enjoining silence with regard to religious disputes. The clergy, however, did not adhere to their bargain, but continued to require the certificates; whereupon the Court changed sides, and banished the Archbishop and several other prelates to their country-houses. The Parliaments, encouraged by this symptom of royal favour, became still more contumacious, and refused to register some royal edicts for the imposition of new taxes required for the contemplated war. To put an end to these contentions, Louis XV., in a *Lit de Justice*, held December 13th, 1756, issued two Declarations. The first of these, concerning the ecclesiastical question, adopted a middle course, and ordained that the bull *Unigenitus* was to be respected, though it was not to be regarded as a rule of faith. With respect to the edicts of taxation, the Parliament of Paris was to send in its remonstrances within a fortnight, and to register the edicts the day after the King's reply to them. These Declarations were accompanied with a royal edict suppressing the chambers of the *Enquêtes* and more than sixty offices of counsellors. This arbitrary proceeding was followed by the immediate resignation of all the members of the Courts of *Enquêtes* and *Requêtes;* an example that was followed by half the *Grand' Chambre*. Out of 200 magistrates, only twenty retained office.

This spontaneous dissolution of the Parliament produced an extraordinary effect on the public, and impelled a crazy fanatic to make an attempt on the King's life. As Louis was entering his carriage at Versailles, on the evening of January 5th, 1757, a man stepped out from among the spectators and wounded him in the side. The wound, which appears to have been inflicted with a small penknife, was not at all dangerous; but the King, under the apprehension that the instrument had been poisoned, kept his bed

several days, gave the Dauphin his last instructions, and like a man at the point of death, caused himself, in the agonies of his conscience, to be absolved five or six times over by a priest. Louis, however, speedily recovered, and Damiens—such was the name of the assassin—who appears to have been an imbecile, was condemned to expiate his crime with torments which were a disgrace to the eighteenth century, and to a civilized nation. Like Ravaillac, his flesh was torn with red-hot pincers, the wounds were filled with molten lead, and he was finally torn asunder by four powerful horses. It is, however, only justice to Louis to say that he disapproved of this cruelty, and that he signified his disgust at the conduct of some great ladies who paid large sums to obtain a view of the execution. Expressions of condolence at Louis's misfortune poured in from all the Courts of Europe: Frederick alone, as we have said, expressed no sympathy and horror.[1] But to return to the negotiations between France and Austria.

By the second treaty between these countries France very much augmented her succours both of troops and money. She was to maintain on foot a force of 105,000 men, besides 10,000 Bavarians and Würtembergers, till Maria Theresa, who was to employ at least 80,000 of her own troops, should have recovered Silesia and Glatz; and was also to pay an annual subsidy of twelve million florins, or about one million sterling, so long as the war should last. Austria was further to obtain the principality of Crossen, with a convenient extent of country; the present possessors of which were to be indemnified out of the Prussian dominions. Negotiations were to be opened with Sweden, the Elector Palatine, the Electors of Bavaria and Saxony, and with the Dutch States-General, who were all to have a share of Prussia proportioned to their exertions in the war. To the negotiations with Sweden we have already alluded. Saxony was to have the Duchy of Magdeburg and the Circle of the Saal, together with the Principality of Halberstadt, in exchange for part of Lusatia. The Elector Palatine and the Elector of Bavaria joined the league in the hope of sharing in the spoils; the Dutch, in spite of the bait of Prussian Cleves, preserved their neutrality. Maria Theresa was to assign the Austrian Netherlands, except what she ceded to France, to the infant Don Philip, who in return was to abandon to her the Duchies of Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla. Maria Theresa reserved, however, the vote and seat in the Imperial Diets annexed to the Circle of Burgundy, the collation of the Order of the Golden

[1] Stenzel, *Gesch. des Preuss. Staats*, B. v. S. 23.

Fleece, and the arms and titles of the House of Burgundy. To France were to be ceded the sovereignty of Chimai and Beaumont, the ports and towns of Ostend, Nieuport, Ypres, Furnes, and Mons, the fortress of Knoque, and a league of territory around each of these places.[1] The French were at once to occupy Ostend and Nieuport provisionally. But by assigning the Austrian Netherlands to a small Prince like the Duke of Parma, Maria Theresa virtually abandoned the whole of them to France.

France had also endeavoured to persuade the Court of Madrid to join the alliance against England and Prussia; and as a lure to Spain, Louis XV., after the conquest of Minorca, offered to make over that island to Ferdinand VI., as well as to assist him in the recovery of Gibraltar. But Ferdinand was not inclined to enter into a war with England, and these offers were rejected.[2]

The forces to be brought into the field by the Powers leagued against Frederick II. amounted to upwards of 400,000 men, to which Prussia and Hanover could not oppose the half of that number. In April, 1757, before the second convention with Austria had been executed, the French took the field with three armies; one of which, under Marshal the Duke de Richelieu, was placed on the Upper Rhine; another, under the Prince de Soubise, on the Main; while the third and principal one, under the Marshal d'Estrées, occupied the Duchies of Gelderland and Cleves, and the greater part of the Prussian territories in Westphalia—Frederick having abandoned these districts in order to concentrate his forces on the Oder. In July the French took possession of Hesse-Cassel, the capital of an ally of Great Britain; the Duke of Cumberland, who commanded the Hanoverian army of observation of about 67,000 men, continually retreating before them. The plan of the French was to reduce the Electorate of Hanover to neutrality, and then to push on into Prussia. The Duke of Cumberland attempted to make a stand at Hastenbeck, but was defeated by D'Estrées. The Duke gave up the battle prematurely, the loss of the French having been twice as great as that of the Hanoverians. In spite of his victory, however, D'Estrées, who was accused of being too slow in his movements, was by a court intrigue superseded in favour of the more brilliant Marshal Richelieu, who had acquired a military reputation by the conquest of Minorca. Richelieu overran the greater part of Brunswick and Hanover, the Duke of Cumberland retiring to Kloster-Seven, between Bremen and

[1] This treaty *in extenso* is in Garden, t. iv.; *Notes et Documens*, No. iii.

[2] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 172.

Hamburg. Thither Richelieu hesitated to pursue him, knowing that Denmark, by the treaty of 1715, already mentioned, had guaranteed the Duchies of Bremen and Verden to the House of Brunswick Lüneburg, and had promised, in case of an attack upon them, to come to its aid with 8,000 men; while the French commander was ignorant that, by a recent Convention executed at Copenhagen, July 11th, 1757, France had promised to respect the neutrality of those two Duchies, reserving, however, the right of pursuing a Hanoverian army which might take refuge in them.[1]

Matters were in this position when Count Lynar offered, on the part of Denmark, to mediate between the combatants. Lynar belonged to the school of Spener and the Pietists, and according to a letter of his which fell into the hands of the Prussians, he attributed this idea to an inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which enabled him to arrest the progress of the French arms, as Joshua had formerly arrested the course of the sun.[2] However this may be, the Duke of Cumberland, pressed thereto by the petty interests and passions of the Hanoverian Ministry and nobles, who were anxious to save their own possessions from annoyance, consented to accept the mediation of Denmark; nor was Richelieu averse to it, as the neutralizing of Hanover would enable him to march against Prussia. Under these circumstances Lynar was employed to draw up the CONVENTION OF KLOSTER-SEVEN, signed September 8th, 1757. By this Convention an armistice was agreed upon, Cumberland's auxiliary troops, namely, those of Hesse, Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Saxe-Gotha, and Lippe-Bückeburg—for there were no British among them—were to be dismissed to their respective countries; the Duke himself, with the Hanoverians, was to retire within twenty-four hours beyond the Elbe, leaving only a garrison of not more than 6,000 men at Stade; and the French were to retain possession of what they had conquered till a peace.[3] But the composition of this document neither reflected much credit on Count Lynar's statesmanship, nor on the penetration and foresight of Richelieu. The duration of the suspension of arms was left undetermined, nor was it stipulated that the Hanoverians and their auxiliaries should be disarmed.

The Prussians had entered Bohemia from Saxony about the same time that the French invaded Westphalia, and a division

[1] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iv. p. 27.
[2] Frederick, *Hist. de la guerre de sept ans*, ch. 5.
[3] *Hinterlassene Staats-schriften des Grafen zu Lynar* (Hamburg, 1797).

under the Prince of Brunswick-Bevern, had repulsed Count Königseck at Reichenberg, April 24th, 1757. Frederick in person, with the main army, marched against Prince Charles of Lorraine and Marshal Brown, who were strongly posted behind Prague, on the Moldau. As the Austrian Marshal Daun was known to be approaching with reinforcements, the King attacked Prince Charles, May 6th, and, after an obstinately contested and bloody battle, which lasted from nine in the morning till eight in the evening, completely defeated him. The Austrian camp, military chest, and sixty guns fell into the hands of the Prussians. The battle of Prague was signalized by the death of two of the most distinguished generals on either side—Marshal Brown, and the Prussian Marshal Schwerin.

After this defeat, Prince Charles threw himself into Prague with the remains of his army of about 40,000 men, where he was blockaded by Frederick; and, such was the prestige of the Prussian arms, that although Frederick's forces were not much more numerous than those which he surrounded, yet the Austrians ventured not upon any attempt to escape. Nay, as Marshal Daun was approaching to relieve them, Frederick was even bold enough to march with a great part of his army to oppose him. But in this hazardous step he was not attended with his usual good fortune, which had hitherto proved so constant to him as to render him somewhat presumptuous. Daun, though rather slow, was an able and cautious general, and his army numbered 20,000 men more than that of the King—54,000 Austrians against some 34,000 Prussians. It is not surprising, therefore, that Frederick was, for the first time, though after a severe contest, entirely defeated in the BATTLE OF KOLIN, June 18th. In consequence of this defeat he was compelled to raise the blockade of Prague, and to retire with all his forces into Silesia. It was on the occasion of this battle that the Empress Queen founded the Order of Maria Theresa.

During the next three or four months Frederick's prospects were gloomy enough. To add to the misfortune of his defeat, Westphalia, as we have seen, was lost; the Hanoverian army beaten and neutralized; the road to Magdeburg open to Richelieu; while the army of the Empire, called the *Army of Execution*, together with a French division under Soubise, had assembled in Thuringia. Marshal Apraxin, with 100,000 Russians, who had occupied Riga early in February, entered Prussia in June, and defeated the Prussians under Lehwald at Gross-Jägerndorf, August 30th; while Memel had been captured by a Russian

maritime force. England had made no preparations to assist Prussia in this quarter; the Russian Court having notified that it should consider the appearance of an English fleet in the Baltic as a declaration of war—a step which the British Cabinet, having its hands full with the French war, as well as for commercial reasons, was anxious not to provoke. The Swedes, under Ungern Sternberg, invaded Pomerania and the Uckermark in September, and took several places. Silesia, and even Brandenburg, seemed to be open to the Austrians; and the Austrian General Haddick actually pushed on to Berlin in October, and levied contributions on that city during the few hours that he held it. In these critical circumstances, Frederick was almost driven to despair. He tells us himself that he meditated suicide; an idea which gave occasion to Voltaire to write him a dissuasive letter, in which he urged all the topics which could occur to a man of genius and wit on such a subject. It was a more sensible step on the part of Frederick to endeavour to open negotiations with the French. Marshal Richelieu, a great nephew of the Cardinal's, had inherited the anti-Austrian policy of that minister, and regarded with disapproval the project of crushing Prussia. He was not, it is said, insensible to flattery or even to bribes; and Frederick made proposals to him in a letter calculated to tickle his vanity, accompanied, it is supposed, with a considerable present. The French Court did not listen to these advances, but they probably contributed to the inactive line of conduct pursued by Richelieu. Frederick was saved by the want of concert and vigour among his enemies. Apraxin, instead of following up his victory at Jägerndorf, retired towards Poland and Courland, and went into winter quarters. This step is ascribed to the fondness and admiration with which the Grand Duke Peter of Holstein-Gottorp, the heir of the Russian throne, regarded the King of Prussia, an esteem which he believed to be reciprocated;[1] and may partly also be attributed to the Russian Chancellor, Bestuscheff, who had sold himself to England and Prussia.[2] Bestuscheff was soon afterwards disgraced at the instance of the Courts of Vienna and Versailles, and Apraxin was recalled; but, fortunately for the King of Prussia, all the commanders who succeeded him—partly from some defect in the Russian military system, partly also from the knowledge that "the young Court," as it was called, or the Grand Duke Peter and his wife, were well disposed towards Frederick—carried on

[1] Lynar's *Hinterlassene Staats-schriften*, iii. S. 469.

[2] Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 133, 141.

the war with little vigour, and did only enough to insure their claims to any conquests. They adopted the convenient custom of putting their troops into winter quarters in defenceless Poland, whence, in general, they did not break up till the middle of summer, to return to them again after a short campaign. The Swedes also did little or nothing this year. Instead of marching on Berlin, as they had agreed with France, they demanded the aid of the French to hold Pomerania on the approach of Lehwald and the Prussians, whom the retreat of the Russians had enabled to advance against them. Lehwald drove them from Pomerania, except the isle of Rügen and Stralsund, which town he invested.

Meanwhile the Imperial Army of Execution, under Hildburghausen, in conjunction with the French under Soubise, marched in September from Franconia into Saxony, which was still occupied by the Prussians. But the Imperial Army was in bad condition, ill provided, armed, and disciplined. Only a few Austrian cavalry regiments were serviceable. Many, especially the Protestants, deserted to Frederick, who was very popular among the German troops, and especially with the officers. Hildburghausen, besides being incompetent, was hated by the army; nor was Soubise a much more skilful general. The greatest disunion prevailed both between the two commanders and their troops. The French looked upon the Germans as little better than a burden. An army so composed was not very formidable, but Frederick had not expected their advance at so late a season. They took advantage of a retrograde movement which he made towards Brandenburg, then infested by the Austrians, to advance to Leipsic; but on his approach they retreated beyond the Saale. Frederick crossed that river and came up with them, November 5th, at ROSSBACH, near Weissenfels, where he gained one of his most splendid victories, taking 7,000 prisoners and seventy-two guns. His success was chiefly due to Seidlitz and his cavalry. Frederick then turned towards the Austrians, who had invaded Silesia, taken Glatz, except the fortress, and Schweidnitz, and defeated the Prince of Brunswick-Bevern near Breslau, November 22nd. The Prince, while riding only with a groom, was captured a day or two after by an Austrian outpost, apparently by his own design; Frederick having told him that he should be answerable with his head for the holding of Breslau. That town was captured by the Austrians, November 24th. But their success was of short duration. Frederick defeated Prince Charles of Lorraine and Marshal Daun, December 5th, at LEUTHEN, near Lissa, a battle

esteemed among the *chef-d'œuvres* of the military art. Although Frederick had only about 33,000 men, 40,000 Austrians were either killed, wounded, dispersed, or made prisoners. The fruits of this victory were the recapture of Breslau, December 19th, although 20,000 men had been left behind for its defence, and the hasty evacuation of all Silesia, with the exception of Schweidnitz, by the Austrians. Daun did not bring back 20,000 men with him into Bohemia. Prince Charles, whose want of military capacity was glaring, now laid down his command, though against the wish of his sister-in-law, Maria Theresa, with whom he was a great favourite, and went to Brussels as Governor of the Austrian Netherlands.

Thus, fortune began again to smile from all sides upon Frederick; nor was a change of policy and the adoption of more vigorous measures on the part of the British Cabinet among the last circumstances which served to encourage his hopes and raise him from despondency. William Pitt, the celebrated Lord Chatham, who now conducted the affairs of England, had resolved to push the war against France with more energy in all quarters, and especially to lend Frederick, whom he regarded with esteem and admiration, more effectual aid.[1] The Convention of Kloster-Seven had been received in England with universal indignation. George II. had at first accepted the Convention, but when he learnt all the circumstances of the conduct of his son, the Duke of Cumberland, his anger knew no bounds. The Duke was recalled, and never again held any military command. Pitt wrote to the King of Prussia, assuring him of his support, and requesting him to appoint a general to the command of the Hanoverian army. Frederick named Ferdinand of Brunswick, brother of the reigning Duke Charles; a brave, accomplished, and amiable prince, of whose military talents he had had ample experience, and especially at the battle of Sorr.[2] It was resolved to repudiate the Convention of Kloster-Seven, which had been equally as displeasing to the French as to the English Court, and had never been acknowledged by Louis XV. It had been repeatedly violated by the French troops, and George II. declared that it was not binding upon him as King of England. The

[1] Raumer, *Friedrich II.* B. ii. S. 423.

[2] This appointment was made October 5th, 1757, and consequently *before* the battle of Rossbach. The change of the English policy, and the repudiation of the Convention of Kloster-Seven, were not, therefore, at all owing to Frederick's success in that battle, as stated by Coxe, Russell, and other historians. See Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* B. ii. S. 331 Anm.

army of the Hanoverian Electorate was now converted into a British army, fighting avowedly for British interests, supported by British troops as well as money, and destined to settle on the plains of the Continent the colonial disputes with France in America and elsewhere. These arrangements were confirmed and carried out by a treaty between the Kings of England and Prussia, signed at London, April 11th, 1758, by which Great Britain engaged to pay a subsidy to Frederick of four million Prussian *thalers*, or upwards of 600,000*l.* sterling, besides supplying a British auxiliary force.[1] On the other hand, the anti-Prussian alliance was augmented by the accession of Denmark. That Power, indeed, by the treaty with France of May 4th, 1758,[2] only agreed to assemble in Holstein an army of 24,000 men, to prevent any attempt on the possessions of the Grand Duke of Russia (Duke of Holstein-Gottorp), or on the neutrality of the towns of Hamburg and Lübeck, without pledging herself to hostility against Prussia; but the allies at least secured themselves from her siding with that Power. This treaty, however, had no effect on the campaign of 1758.

The English subsidies, though somewhat offensive to Frederick's pride, were indispensable to him. He was driven to hard shifts to procure the means for carrying on the war. He told his brother Henry that, though they might be heroes, they were beggars; and that, if the struggle should continue, he must go upon the highway to find the means for supporting it. Hence, in spite of his recent success, he would willingly have made peace. His sister, the Margravine of Baireuth, made some advances to the French Court to that purpose, through Cardinal Tencin, but without effect; nor were Frederick's own hints to Maria Theresa of more avail. He was unwilling to increase the taxes in his hereditary dominions, and hence he made Saxony bear the chief burden of the war, a course which he thought might induce the King of Poland to come to an accommodation with him. With the same view, as well as from the less worthy motive of personal hatred and revenge, he caused the palaces and estates of Count Brühl to be plundered and devastated. It is computed that he levied in Saxony during the course of the war between forty and fifty million dollars, without including unlicensed plundering, which might amount to as much more. Anhalt, Dessau, and other

[1] Wenck, t. iii. p. 173. This treaty was thrice renewed: December 7th, 1758, March 9th, 1759, and December 12th, 1760.

[2] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iv.; *Notes et Documens*, No. viii.

small States, were subjected to the same hard pressure. Frederick had also recourse to the expedient of coining light money. But his chief resource was England.[1] In consequence of the policy adopted by the British Cabinet, Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick had announced to Marshal Richelieu the renewal of hostilities, November 26th, 1757. As the Hanoverian troops and auxiliaries had not been disarmed, although the French, in spite of the silence of the Convention on that head, had attempted to enforce a disarmament, the army was soon reassembled. Nothing, however, was attempted during the remainder of the year, except the siege of Harburg, and the troops were then put into winter quarters.

Marshal Richelieu was recalled from his command in Germany early in 1758, and was replaced by Count Clermont, a prince of the blood royal. Nothing could exceed the demoralization of the French troops under Richelieu and Soubise. The armies were encumbered with multitudes of tradesmen, valets, and courtesans, and were followed by beasts of burden three times more numerous than the troop horses. Twelve thousand carts of dealers and *vivandières* accompanied the army of Soubise, without reckoning the baggage train of the officers. The camp became a sort of movable fair, in which were displayed all the objects of fashion and luxury.[2] Richelieu had employed the winter to enrich himself by plundering Hanover and the adjacent provinces, and he permitted his officers and men to follow his example. The soldiers called him *Père la Maraude*. These disorders were naturally accompanied with a complete relaxation of discipline. The French soldiers, as well as their commanders, seemed almost to have forgotten the art of war. Maillebois, chief of the staff, complained in an official report to the Minister that the troops pillaged churches, committed every possible atrocity, and were more ready to plunder than to fight. In the same report he attributes the victory at Hastenbeck chiefly to the artillery.[3] Manœuvring was so little understood that it took a whole day to range an army in order of battle.[4] Against such degenerate troops it is not surprising that the military talents of Ferdinand of Brunswick, seconded by the more active assistance of England, speedily destroyed the French preponderance in Germany. Opening the campaign early in 1758, he drove the French from Hanover, Brunswick, East Friesland, and Hesse. On

[1] Stenzel, *Gesch. des Pr. Staats*, B. v. 134 ff.

[2] See Archenholtz, *Gesch. des 7 jährigen Kriegs*, Buch. iii.

[3] *French Archives*, ap. Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* B. ii. S. 330.

[4] Rochambeau, *Mémoires*, ap. Martin, t. xv. p. 522.

March 14th he took Minden after a four days' siege, and pursued the French to Kaiserswerth, which he entered May 31st. The French lost in their retreat large quantities of ammunition, baggage, and men. Having refreshed his army, Ferdinand crossed the Rhine at Emmerich, driving the French before him. Clermont, having attempted to make a stand at Crefeld, was entirely defeated, June 23rd. The Hanoverians then took Ruremonde and Düsseldorf, their light troops penetrating as far as Brussels, while the French retreated to Neuss and Cologne. Louis XV., after these disasters, appointed three generals to assist Clermont, who thereupon demanded his dismissal. He was succeeded by Contades.

Ferdinand now determined on invading the Austrian Netherlands, but from this he was diverted by the French under Soubise entering Hesse, whither that commander had been attracted by Ferdinand's successes, instead of marching into Bohemia to assist the Austrians. The Duke de Broglie, with the French van, defeated at Sangershausen, near Cassel, July 23rd, a division which Ferdinand had left in Hesse; the French then overran that province, entered Minden, and opened the road to Hanover. Ferdinand now recrossed the Rhine, and marched upon Münster; but nothing of much importance occurred during the remainder of the campaign. Ferdinand succeeded in preventing the junction of Contades, who had followed him, with Soubise, although a division of his army was attacked and defeated by Chevert at Lutternberg, October 10th, and both sides went soon afterwards into winter quarters; the Hanoverians in the North of Westphalia, and the French in the neighbourhood of Frankfort.

During this year, under the energetic administration of Pitt, the war had been vigorously pushed in all quarters of the globe; several successes had been achieved at sea, the most notable of which were Admiral Osborn's victory, near Carthagena, over a French squadron under Du Quesne, and that of Sir Edward Hawke, near the Isle of Aix. A descent, which Pitt had projected, on the French coast, conducted by Commodore Anson and Lord Howe, with 20,000 troops of debarkment, was not eminently successful. A few ships of war and a considerable number of merchantmen were burnt at St. Malo. A landing was effected at Cherbourg, and the forts and basin, together with a few ships, were destroyed; but a second attempt upon St. Malo was repulsed with considerable loss to the invaders, September 11th.

Frederick's campaign of 1758 was not attended with his usual

good fortune, and it was with difficulty that he succeeded in maintaining himself against his numerous enemies. He had opened the campaign by retaking Schweidnitz from the Austrians, April 16th, and being averse to stand on the defensive, he resolved to carry the war into Moravia, whilst the Austrians were expecting him in Bohemia. He, therefore, marched to Olmütz, and laid siege to that place; but after wasting two months before it, finding that his convoys were intercepted, and that the Russians were approaching, he raised the siege, July 3rd, in order to march against the latter, effecting an admirable retreat through Bohemia, instead of Silesia, where the Austrians had made preparations to receive him. The Russian army under Fermor had begun its march in January. It took possession of Königsberg on the 22nd of that month, then of all Prussia, and advanced to the frontiers of Pomerania and the New Mark, the Russian irregular troops, especially the Cossacks and Calmucks, committing fearful cruelties and devastations on the way. Fermor laid siege to Cüstrin, August 15th, but though the town was reduced to ashes by the Russian fire, the commandant refused to surrender the citadel. Frederick hastened to his relief, and, having formed a junction with Count Dohna's division, attacked the Russians at Zorndorf, August 25th. This battle, the bloodiest of the war, lasted from nine in the morning almost till nine at night. The Russians, who were much more numerous than their opponents, lost 19,000 men, besides 3,000 prisoners and 103 guns, whilst the Prussian loss was 12,000 men and 26 guns. The battle had been chiefly sustained by the Prussian cavalry under Seidlitz.[1] The Russians retired to Landsberg, and afterwards laid siege to Colberg, but raised it October 30th.

Frederick, after the battle of Zorndorf, hastened to the assistance of his brother Henry in Saxony, who was hard pressed by the Austrians under Daun, and the army of the Empire under Prince Frederick of Deux-Ponts, who had formed a junction with the Austrians in Bohemia. Frederick having taken up an insecure position at Hochkirch, in Lusatia, and obstinately adhering to it, in spite of the remonstrances of his generals, was surprised by Daun, for whom he had too great a contempt, on the night of October 13th, and forced to abandon his camp-baggage and 101 guns. The Prussian loss on this occasion was 9,000 to the enemy's

[1] Seidlitz having neglected an order of the King's, which would have exposed his men to needless loss, and Frederick having repeated it on pain of the general losing his head, Seidlitz replied, "Tell the King that after the battle my head is at his disposal; while the battle lasts, let him suffer me to use it for his service." Stenzel, B. v. S. 165.

7,000; and was aggravated by the death of Frederick's brother-in-law, Francis of Brunswick, and also by that of Marshal Keith.[1] In spite of this disaster, Frederick established his camp within a league of Hochkirch; whence, after being reinforced by his brother Henry, he marched into Silesia to relieve Neisse. The Austrians retired at his approach, and Frederick then returned into Saxony, as the Army of Execution was investing Leipsic, and Daun threatening Dresden. The allies now quitted Saxony, and went into winter quarters in Bohemia and Franconia. The Swedes this year accomplished nothing memorable in Pomerania and the Ucker Mark.

England and Prussia had, in November, 1758, declared, through Duke Louis of Brunswick, to the ambassadors of the belligerent Powers at the Hague that they were ready to treat for a peace, but without effect. It was chiefly Maria Theresa who opposed an accommodation. She still hoped to humble Prussia, and she was supported in the struggle by the resources of her husband, who carried on a sort of banking trade. France was pretty well exhausted by the war; yet Louis XV. and his mistress were constant in their hatred of Frederick. The Duke de Choiseul, however, who had recently acceded to the Ministry, and who had more talent than his predecessors, and a better view of French interests, endeavoured to come to an understanding with the Empress-Queen; and he proposed to her to content herself with the County of Glatz and part of Lusatia, that so a peace might be made with England through the mediation of Prussia; but if she should be inclined to try the fortune of another campaign, then France must give up the Treaty of May, 1757, and return to that of 1756. Kaunitz, having rejected all thought of peace, especially under Prussian mediation, a fresh treaty was concluded between France and Austria, December 30th, 1758, less favourable to Austria than that of 1757, but more so than that of the preceding year. The French army in Germany was reduced from 105,000 to 100,000 men, and the subsidy from twelve million florins to about half that sum. All the projects for a partition of Prussia, contained in the treaty of 1757, were abandoned, and France even gave up the share assigned to her of the Netherlands. That Power, however, guaranteed Silesia and Glatz to Maria Theresa, but not the Duchy of Crossen; also the restoration of the Elector of Saxony in his

[1] This distinguished officer, having been implicated with his brother, the Earl-Mareschal of Scotland, in the Rebellion of 1715, fled his country, and after having commanded with distinction in the Russian service, entered that of Prussia.

dominions, with some compensation.[1] Russia acceded to the treaty, March 7th, 1760. Thus the condescendence of Louis XV. for Maria Theresa seemed to make France a second-rate Power. Except, perhaps, the chance of humbling George II. by the conquest of Hanover, France had but little interest in the struggle on the Continent after abandoning the prospect of obtaining the Netherlands; and Maria Theresa inferred from that abandonment that France would pursue the war but languidly, and take the first opportunity to retire from it.

Prince Ferdinand, in the spring of 1759, attempted to surprise the French in their winter quarters, but was defeated by the Duke of Broglie at the battle of Bergen, April 13th, and compelled to retreat with considerable loss. The French then advanced through Hesse to Minden and Münster, which last place surrendered, July 25th. But Ferdinand defeated the French army under Contades at Minden, August 1st, which compelled them to evacuate Hesse and retreat to Frankfort, where they took up winter quarters. The Battle of Minden was gained by the bold and spontaneous advance of six English battalions, which broke the French centre, composed of sixty-three squadrons of cavalry. Contades confessed he had not thought it possible that a single line of infantry should have overthrown three lines of cavalry in order of battle.[2] The victory would have been still more decisive had not Lord George Sackville, who commanded the British cavalry, neglected Prince Ferdinand's order to charge.

The King of Prussia contented himself this year with observing Marshal Daun and the Austrians. But his general, Wedell, having been defeated by the Russians at Züllichau, in the Duchy of Crossen, July 23rd, and the Russians having subsequently seized Frankfort on the Oder, Frederick marched against them with all the troops he could spare. They had now been joined by an Austrian corps, which increased their force to 96,000 men; yet Frederick, who had just half that number, attacked them at Kunersdorf, August 12th. After a hard-fought day he was defeated and compelled to retreat with a loss of 18,000 men. In this battle Frederick had two horses shot under him, and was himself hit with a bullet, which was fortunately stopped by a golden *étui*. He acknowledged that had the Russians pursued their victory Prussia would have been lost. But they were tired of

[1] Wenck, t. iii. p. 185; Garden, t. iv. 54 sq.

[2] Stenzel, B. v. S. 204; M. Martin (t. xv. p. 555), in his account of the battle, suppresses this English achievement.

bearing the chief brunt of the war while the Austrians seemed to rest upon their arms; and Soltikoff, their commander, told the Austrians that he had done enough. Meanwhile the army of the Empire, under Frederick of Deux-Ponts, had entered Saxony, and in the course of August took Leipsic, Torgau, and Wittenberg; and on December 5th, Dresden. Frederick, after he had got quit of the Russians, entered Saxony and recovered that Electorate, with the exception of Dresden, where Daun entrenched himself. This commander compelled the Prussian general, Fink, with 10,000 men, to surrender at Moxen, November 21st.

Choiseul, the new French Minister, in order to create a diversion, projected an invasion of England. The Pretender went to Vannes, and large forces were assembled in Brittany and at Dunkirk. But the French were not strong enough at sea to carry out such a design. Rodney bombarded Havre, and damaged the French magazines and transports; while Boys, Hawke, and Boscawen blockaded Dunkirk, Brest, and Toulon. The English fleet having been blown from Toulon by a storm, the French fleet managed to get out; but it was overtaken and defeated by Boscawen off the coast of Portugal, August 17th, 1759. The grand armament, under Conflans, which had sailed from Brest, was defeated and dispersed by Hawke off Belle Isle, November 20th. Thurot, escaping in a hazy night with four frigates from Dunkirk, after beating about three months, landed at Carrick Fergus, but was defeated and killed on leaving the bay.

This year the Northern Powers formed an alliance which may be regarded as the precursor of the Armed Neutrality. By a treaty between Russia and Sweden, signed at St. Petersburg, March 9th, 1759, to which Denmark next year acceded, the contracting Powers engaged to maintain a fleet in order to preserve the neutrality of the Baltic Sea for the purposes of commerce. Even the trade of Prussia was not to be molested, except with blockaded ports, or in cases of contraband of war.[1]

The struggle on the Continent lingered on two or three more years without any decisive result. The various turns of fortune were no doubt highly interesting and exciting to the parties engaged, and the details of the military operations might perhaps even now be perused by the military student with amusement and instruction; but our limits will not permit us to enter into them at any length, and we must, therefore, as before, content ourselves with indicating the main incidents of each campaign. That of

[1] Martens, *Suppl. au Recueil*, t. iii. pp. 36, 42.

1760 was unfavourable to the Hanoverians. The French again invaded Hesse; the hereditary Prince of Brunswick was defeated at Corbach, July 10th, and Prince Xavier de Saxe took Cassel and penetrated into Hanover. By way of making a diversion, Prince Ferdinand despatched his nephew to the Lower Rhine; but though he reduced Cleves and Rheinsberg, and laid siege to Wesel, he was defeated by the Marquis de Castries at Kloster Camp, October 16th, and compelled to recross the Rhine; and the French remained during the winter in Hanover and Hesse.

The Austrians and Russians had formed a grand plan to conquer Silesia and penetrate into Brandenburg. The Prussian general, Fouqué, was defeated near Landshut, June 23rd, by Loudon,[1] with much superior forces, and his whole division, consisting of more than 10,000 men, were either killed, wounded, or made prisoners. Frederick, opposing his brother Henry to the Russians in Silesia, took himself the command of the army in Saxony, and laid siege to Dresden, but was compelled to raise it on the approach of Marshal Daun. Meanwhile, General Harsch, having taken Glatz, July 26th, and Breslau being threatened by Loudon, Frederick quitted Saxony to defend Silesia. He defeated Loudon at Pfaffendorp, near Liegnitz, August 15th, and forming a junction with his brother Henry, took up a position where the enemy did not venture to attack him, and thus frustrated their plans. To draw him from Silesia, the Russians marched on Berlin, entered that city, October 9th, and levied heavy contributions on the inhabitants; but, after an occupation of three days, they evacuated it on the approach of Frederick, and recrossed the Oder. Meanwhile the Imperialists, having occupied the greater part of Saxony, Frederick, marching into that Electorate, retook Wittenberg and Leipsic, and attacked Marshal Daun near Torgau, November 3rd, whom he defeated with much difficulty and with great loss on both sides. Frederick entered Torgau, November 4th, and subsequently attempted to recover Dresden, but without success. The movements of the Swedes were unimportant.

[1] Such is the true name of this distinguished Austrian commander, and not Laudon or Laudohn, as commonly written. He derived his origin from a Scotch family of Ayrshire, but his ancestor had migrated to Livonia in the fourteenth century. Loudon offered his sword to the King of Prussia, but being repulsed entered the Austrian service, and became one of Frederick's most dangerous opponents. Mailath, *Gesch. Oestr.* B. v. S. 72.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

AT this period of the Seven Years' War two events had occurred which had a remarkable influence on the views and operations of the contending Powers. These were the death of Ferdinand VI. of Spain, August 10th, 1759, and that of George II. of England, October 25th, 1760. Ferdinand VI., though a weak and hypochondriac, was an amiable Prince, whose sole pursuits were music and the chase. He had always been inclined to maintain peace with England, and the quiet temper of his Consort, Barbara, daughter of John V. of Portugal, which formed quite a contrast to that of Elizabeth Farnese, confirmed him in this disposition.[1] Ferdinand's chief Ministers were the Marquis Villarias and the Marquis de la Ensenada; but Villarias was soon supplanted by Don Joseph de Carvajal, a younger son of the Duke of Linares, a cold, stiff, awkward person, but of a strong understanding. Descended from the House of Lancaster, Carvajal, from family traditions, was attached to England, though as a statesman, he was for keeping Spain politically independent of any other country. The King was a good deal govered by his Confessor, Father Ravago, a Jesuit. But one of the most influential persons at the Spanish Court was Farinelli, a Neapolitan singer, who had achieved a great success at the London opera, and realized a considerable fortune. Farinelli had been employed by the late Queen of Spain to soothe her husband's melancholy with his songs; he gained Philip's favour and confidence, who settled upon him a pension of 2,000*l.* sterling. After the accession of Ferdinand, he rose still higher in the royal favour. Both the King and his Consort were fond of music, and Farinelli was made director of the opera and of all the royal entertainments. Behind all this, however, being a man of sense and of modest and unassuming manners, he exercised a material influence at Court; his friendship was sought even by Sovereigns, and Maria Theresa had condescended to write to him with her own hand.

[1] The characters of these sovereigns are described in Sir Benjamin Keene's *Despatches*, ann. 1749 sq.; cf. *Mémoires de Richelieu*, t. vi. ch. xxix.

When the war between France and England appeared imminent, both Powers contended for the favour and support of the Court of Madrid. Carvajal had died in the spring of 1754; but the English party was supported by the Duke de Huescar, afterwards Duke of Alva, and by Count Valparaiso. Ferdinand himself was averse to the French alliance. He had been offended by the Court of Versailles concluding the preliminaries of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle without his concurrence, and by its refusal to accept his favourite sister, Maria Antonietta, as Consort of the Dauphin after the death of her elder sister, to whom that Prince had been betrothed. Huescar and Valparaiso succeeded in excluding Ensenada, a partisan of France, from the management of the Foreign Office; but as neither of those grandees wished to take an active part in the Ministry, Sir Benjamin Keene, at that time British Minister at the Court of Madrid, directed their attention to Don Ricardo Wall, then Spanish Ambassador at London. Wall was an Irish adventurer, who had sought fortune in the Peninsula. He had distinguished himself in the action with the British fleet under Byng off Sicily in 1718; had subsequently entered the land service, and ultimately the Civil Service of Spain; and was now, at the recommendation of Keene, appointed Foreign Minister. Ensenada, in order to recover his ascendency, had endeavoured to plunge Spain into a war with Great Britain by despatching secret orders to the Viceroy of Mexico to drive the English from their settlements at Rio Wallis. This wicked attempt ended only in the dismissal and arrest of Ensenada. The neutrality of Spain, however, became somewhat dubious. France, after the capture of Minorca, had endeavoured to lure Spain to her alliance with the offer of that island, and with a promise to assist her in recovering Gibraltar; a sort of underhand privateering warfare, encouraged by the Spanish underlings,[1] had broken out between England and Spain, which, together with the petty discussions which ensued, had caused much irritation. Mr. Pitt took a very gloomy view of matters after the defeat of the Hanoverian army.[2] The English Government was particularly alarmed by Maria Theresa having admitted French garrisons into Ostend and Nieuport, and looked with great suspicion on the plans of Austria in Italy. Under the influence of these feelings, and by way of counteracting the offers of France, Pitt authorized Sir B. Keene to propose to the Court of Madrid the restoration of Gibraltar, as well as the evacuation

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 172.

[2] See his *Despatch* to Sir B. Keene, August 23rd, 1757. *Ibid.* p. 187 sqq.

of the settlements made by the English on the Mosquito shore and Bay of Honduras since 1748, on condition that Spain should assist Great Britain in recovering Minorca. These injudicious proposals, which were highly disapproved of by Keene, were fortunately not accepted by the Spanish Court; and Ferdinand preserved his neutrality till his death, an event thought to have been hastened by grief at the loss of his Consort, Barbara, who had died a year before. Ferdinand VI. was forty-six years of age at the time of his decease. His peaceful policy was stigmatized during his lifetime as unpatriotic, but has since been recognized as wise and salutary for his Kingdom. During the fourteen years of his reign Spain quietly improved her agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. The enormous exactions and embezzlements of the Court of Rome were also reduced by a Concordat with Pope Benedict XIV., January 11th, 1755; who, in consideration of a million Roman crowns, the patronage of fifty-two benefices, the produce of marriage licences, and the perpetuation of the Bull of the Cruzada, surrendered all further claims—a tolerably advantageous composition.[1]

Ferdinand, by his will, appointed his half-brother Charles, King of Naples, to be his successor, and Charles's mother, the Queen Dowager Elizabeth, to be Regent till her son's arrival. Yet a good understanding had not subsisted between the brothers during Ferdinand's lifetime. Don Carlos, feeling assured of the Spanish Succession, which, in failure of direct heirs, had been guaranteed to him by the Peace of Vienna, and Ferdinand's weak health and the age of his Consort rendering him pretty certain of it, had affected an insulting independence, had caballed with parties in Spain, and in conjunction with his brother, Don Philip, Duke of Parma, had, in opposition to the Court of Madrid, formed a close union with France. The hopes of that country were therefore revived by his accession to the Spanish Throne. His arrival in Spain was, however, delayed by the necessary arrangements for settling the succession to the Crown of Naples. At the Peace of Vienna it had been arranged that the Two Sicilies should always be separated from Spain; and by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which assigned Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla to Don

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 219 sqq. The Pope had previously enjoyed the nomination to all preferments falling vacant during eight months of the year, hence called *Apostolical Months*. Persons appointed to such benefices, usually foreigners, gave bonds or bills called *cedulas bancarias*, to pay a certain sum to the Apostolic Chamber, which are said alone to have drained the Spanish benefices of one-fifth of their revenues. *Ibid.*

Philip, it was provided that if Don Carlos were called to the Spanish Throne, and Philip should succeed his brother at Naples, Parma and Guastalla were to revert to Austria, while the Duchy of Piacenza, except the Capital and the district beyond the Nure, was to be ceded to Sardinia. Charles, however, was desirous that one of his sons should succeed him in his Neapolitan dominions; and the Court of Vienna, wishing to conciliate the new King of Spain, did not press its claims to the Italian Duchies; while the King of Sardinia, unable singly to assert his rights, was compensated with a sum of money. The Austro-Spanish Alliance was consolidated by a marriage between the Archduke Joseph and a Princess of Parma, and another between Leopold, successor to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, and a Spanish Infanta. Charles's eldest son, Philip, being imbecile, was entirely set aside; his second son, Charles, was declared Heir of the Spanish Monarchy, and Ferdinand, the third son, was proclaimed King of the Two Sicilies, with the title of Ferdinand IV.;[1] but as he was only eight years of age, a Regency was appointed to govern the Neapolitan dominions till he should come of age. The reign of Don Carlos had been beneficial to Naples, where he was very popular. He arrived in Madrid December 9th, 1759. One of his first acts was to dismiss Farinelli, who retired to Bologna. Wall and most of the former Ministers were retained; Ensenada was pardoned and returned to Court, but not to power. Charles caused his second son to be acknowledged as Prince of Asturias.

The accession of Charles III. was followed by a change in the policy of Spain. That King had conceived an antipathy against the English for having compelled him to desert the cause of his House during the Italian War; and though his prejudices were mitigated awhile by his Consort, Amelia, a Saxon Princess, favourable to England, yet after her death in 1760 they broke out afresh, and were sedulously fomented by the French Court.

The signal defeats sustained by France at sea, and the almost total loss of her possessions in America and the East Indies, had forced upon the attention of the French Cabinet the necessity for some change of policy. For the first two or three years of the war the French had been successful in America. They had formed a plan to reduce all the English forts in the neighbourhood of the Lakes; and the capture of Oswego by the Marquis de Montcalm in 1756, when he seized a great quantity of vessels, as well as

[1] Ferdinand was on this occasion invested with a sword, which he afterwards presented to Nelson. Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* B. ii. S. 386.

stores and ammunition, gave them for a while the superiority in that quarter. In the following year Montcalm captured Fort William Henry on Lake George. But this was the term of the French success. In 1758 the British besieged and took Louisbourg, the Capital of Cape Breton, reduced all that island, and also made some conquests on the Lakes and the River Ohio. In the same year, in Africa, they took Fort Louis on the Senegal, and the Island of Goree. In 1759 the British arms were still more successful. After the reduction of Cape Breton, a plan was formed for the conquest of Canada; the French were defeated near Quebec by General Wolfe, September 13th, in an action in which both that Commander and the French General, Montcalm, lost their lives; a victory followed by the surrender of Quebec, and in the following year by the capture of Montreal and the occupation of all Canada by the English. In the same year Guadaloupe, and some smaller islands also surrendered to the British arms. In the East Indies the successes of the French and English had been more balanced; but on the whole the British arms had the advantage.

Two courses lay open to the French minister, Choiseul; either to make a separate peace with Great Britain, or to fortify himself by an alliance with Spain, and to draw that country into a war with England. He resolved to try the former of these courses, and in case of failure to fall back upon the other. The death of George II. and accession of George III. were favourable to his views. The young King was governed by Lord Bute, an opponent of Pitt's policy, who had succeeded the Earl of Holdernesse as Secretary of State for the Northern Department. George III.'s English birth and education had weaned him from that fondness for the Hanoverian Electorate which had been the mainspring of the continental policy of his two predecessors. He had declared in the first speech to his Parliament that he gloried "in the name of Briton;" and though such an expression might be merely a bait for popular applause, it might likewise indicate a determination to attend more strictly to the insular interests of England. Already, indeed, in the preparing of the speech, a difference of opinion had manifested itself in the Council. In the first draft the King had been made to declare that he ascended the throne in the midst of an expensive war, which he would endeavour to prosecute in the manner most likely to bring about an honourable and lasting peace; and Pitt obtained, with much difficulty, that, in the printed copy, the words "but just and necessary" should be inserted after

"expensive," and "in concert with our allies" after "lasting peace."[1]

Pitt, however, who continued to direct the English counsels during the time that he remained in office, resolved to prosecute the war as vigorously as ever, and it was with him that Choiseul had to negotiate for a peace. As the war between England and France for their possessions beyond sea had really nothing in common with the continental war, except that they were simultaneous, Louis XV. obtained the consent of his allies that he should treat with Great Britain for a separate peace; while it was proposed that a Congress should assemble at Augsburg with a view to a general pacification. Negotiations were accordingly opened between the French and English Cabinets in March, 1761.[2] It must be admitted that in the course of them the natural haughtiness of Pitt's temper sometimes led him to reject with disdain proposals which seemed reasonable enough. Thus, the French Minister offered to treat on the basis of *uti possidetis*, which was certainly favourable to England, as the English conquests had been far more considerable than those of France. Pitt did not object to this basis, but to the periods fixed for it: namely, May 1st for Europe, July 1st for Africa and America, and September 1st for the East Indies; and he declared that he would admit no other epoch than that of the signing of the Treaty of Peace. The French Cabinet naturally objected to so loose and unreasonable a method; yet, though they had offered to consider of other periods more convenient to Great Britain, Pitt delayed to answer. He was, in fact, awaiting the issue of the expedition which he had despatched against Belle Isle. A squadron under Commodore Keppel, with 9000 troops under General Hodgson, effected a landing in that island towards the end of April, but the citadel of Palais, the capital, was not finally reduced till June 7th. Belle Isle is small and barren; but its situation off the coast of Brittany, between L'Orient and the mouth of the Loire, seemed to give it importance; and it was thought that such a conquest in sight of the French coast might, merely as a point of honour, be set off against Minorca. Pitt now consented, in a memorial, dated June 17th, to accept the dates of July 1st, September 1st, and November 1st, for the *uti possidetis*, two months later than those proposed by France, evidently for the purpose of including Belle Isle. Some discussion

[1] Coxe, *Mem. of Lord Walpole.*

[2] An elaborate and able, but, of course, partial, account of them, with the different notes and memoirs, drawn up by the Duke of Choiseul himself, will be found in Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iv. pp. 87-193.

ensued, and the French Minister delayed his final answer till July 15th. Meanwhile the negotiations which had been for some time going on between France and Spain had been brought to maturity; and the French memorial alluded to, of July 15th, was accompanied with another relating to Spain. Several Spanish demands and alleged grievances against England were brought forward for settlement, as the restitution by Great Britain of some prizes under the Spanish flag; the liberty of Spanish subjects to fish at Newfoundland; and the destruction of English establishments on Spanish territory in the Bay of Honduras; and in order that the future peace might not be disturbed by the quarrels of these two countries, it was proposed that the King of Spain should guarantee the peace between England and France. Pitt naturally rejected such a proposal with surprise and indignation; he expressed his astonishment that disputes between friends should be submitted to the mediation of an enemy, and that they should be brought forward by a French envoy, while the ambassador of his Catholic Majesty was entirely silent upon the subject! The French Minister, in his subsequent correspondence, dropped, indeed, all mention of Spain; but the reply to the application which the British Cabinet now deemed it prudent to make to that of Spain, showed a perfect understanding between the two Bourbon Courts. The Spanish Minister, Wall, declared to Lord Bristol, who had succeeded Sir B. Keene as English Ambassador at Madrid, that the French memorial concerning Spain had been presented with the entire consent of his Catholic Majesty; that nothing would induce his Sovereign to separate his counsels from those of France, nor deter him from acting in perfect harmony with that country.[1] An unsatisfactory answer was also returned to Lord Bristol's inquiries respecting the warlike preparations in the Spanish ports.

Shortly afterwards was signed at Paris, the celebrated treaty between France and Spain, known, like two former ones, as the Family Compact (August 15th, 1761). This measure had been carried through by the Duke de Choiseul and the Marquis de Ossuna, the Spanish Ambassador at Paris, in spite of the opposition of Wall. The lures held out to Spain were, as before, the restoration of Minorca and the recovery of Gibraltar. In the preamble of the treaty, the motives of it were said to be the ties of blood and reciprocal esteem. The two Bourbon Monarchs agreed in future to consider the enemy of one as the enemy of both. They mutually guaranteed each other's dominions when they should next be at

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 261.

peace with all the world—for Spain did not undertake to reconquer the possessions lost by France during the war—and stipulated the amount of reciprocal succours. French wars on account of the Peace of Westphalia, as well as those arising out of the alliances of France with German Princes, were excepted from the operation of the treaty *unless some Maritime Power should take part in them*, or France should be invaded *by land*. The King of the Two Sicilies was to be invited to accede to the treaty, and none but a Bourbon Prince was to be admitted into the alliance.[1] But neither the King of Naples nor the Duke of Parma acceded to it.

On the same day a particular Convention was signed by the two Powers, by which Spain engaged to declare war against Great Britain, on May 1st, 1762, if a peace had not been concluded at that date. Louis XV. undertook to include Spanish interests in his negotiations with England; to assign Minorca to Spain on May 1st following, and to endeavour that it should be assured to her at the peace. Portugal was to be invited to join in the war, it being declared unjust that she should remain neuter in order to enrich herself.[2] This Convention related only to the present war, while the treaty was to be perpetual. These treaties were to be kept secret, in order to afford time for the American treasure-vessels to arrive in Spain; but the English Government obtained intelligence of them. Such a league, of course, overthrew all hopes of peace; yet the French Cabinet continued the negotiations, and in its last memorial, of September 9th, repeated its offers of large concessions, though with the renewed intimation that it could not evacuate Wesel, Geldern, and the Prussian possessions in Westphalia, nor consent that Great Britain should lend any help to the King of Prussia after the peace.[3] Pitt, with that high sense of national honour which distinguished him, and which forms so favourable a contrast to the subsequent conduct of Lord Bute, would not for a moment entertain the thought of thus deserting an ally. He did not even condescend to reply to the French memorial, but instructed Lord Stanley, who had conducted the negotiations at Paris, to apply for his passports, and the negotiations terminated.

The Congress of Augsburg had also no result. The King of

[1] Martens, *Recueil des principaux Traités depuis*, 1761, t. i. p. 1; Wenck, *Codex Juris. Gent. rec.* t. iii. p. 278.

[2] Flassan, *Diplomatie Franç.* t. vi. p. 314 sq. and 322 sqq.; Garden, *Hist. des Traités de Paix*, t. iv. p. 79 sq. Coxe does not mention this Convention, but merely observes: "From this moment the question of peace or war was evidently decided by the two Bourbon Courts."—*Span. Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 264.

[3] Garden, *ibid.* p. 178.

Prussia objected to any Imperial Ambassador appearing at it, as he denied that he was at war with the Empire; nor, through the dissensions between the Catholic and Protestant members, could the Emperor obtain from the Diet at Ratisbon authority to conclude a peace. The Empress-Queen was for continuing the war; and her party prevailed at the Russian Court, while Sweden was in the hands of France. The King of Poland, whose Saxon dominions suffered terribly by the war, was sincerely desirous of peace; but, by himself, he had little weight, and, for fear of offending his powerful allies, he hardly ventured to display his peaceable inclinations.[1]

The war had continued during these negotiations. In February, 1761, Prince Ferdinand penetrated into Hesse, but being repulsed by the French, under Broglie, near Grünberg, March 21st, was compelled to evacuate the Landgraviate. During the remainder of the campaign he remained on the defensive on the banks of the Lippe. The French, under Soubise and Broglie, attacked his right wing near Wellinghausen, July 15th, but were repulsed, and the campaign had no results, though Ferdinand had not half the forces of his opponents. The Austrians, in Silesia, under Loudon, assisted by a large Russian force, marched on Breslau; whilst another Russian army, supported by the Russian and Swedish fleets, besieged Colberg. Frederick covered Schweidnitz and Breslau by establishing a fortified camp, first at Kunzendorf, near Freiburg, where he lay six or seven weeks, and then at Bunzelwitz. Here his small army was surrounded by 140,000 Austrians and Russians; the latter, however, were not anxious to fight for the benefit of the Austrians, and retired, in September, into Poland. After their departure Frederick marched to attack Loudon, who had encamped near Freiburg; when the Austrian commander took advantage of his departure to surprise Schweidnitz in the night of September 30th, and made the garrison prisoners, to the number of 3,600 men. This action, and the capture of Colberg by the Russians, December 16th, are the only memorable events of the campaign in this quarter. Frederick's brother, Prince Henry, succeeded in maintaining himself against Marshal Daun in Saxony.

The year 1762 opened under gloomy auspices for the Alliance of Hanover. Spain was now added to the opposite side. After the conclusion of the Family Compact, Pitt had counselled an immediate declaration of war against Spain, before her preparations

[1] Stenzel, *Gesch. des Preuss. Staats*, B. v. S. 266 f.

should be completed; but his opinion being overruled by Lord Bute and the King, the great Minister resigned (October 5th, 1761). He was succeeded by the Earl of Egremont, but Bute was the virtual director of the English Cabinet. The event showed the wisdom of Pitt's advice. The Cabinet of London demanded, at first in measured terms, that Spain should communicate the treaty which she had concluded with France. Wall evaded this inquiry till the treasure had arrived from America, and then spoke out more boldly, while the English demands also became more peremptory. There were now no motives to check the explosion of Castilian pride. The passports of the English Ambassador were made out and delivered to him in December; on January 2nd, 1762, England declared war against Spain; to which the Cabinet of Madrid replied by a manifesto of the 18th of the same month.

If matters looked threatening for England, they were still more menacing for the King of Prussia. The retirement of Pitt had deprived him of his best friend. Bute and the Tories denounced the foreign policy of that Minister, and prepared to withdraw the subsidies which Frederick had hitherto enjoyed. The King of Prussia, they alleged, neither had done, nor could do, anything for Hanover or England, and all the resources of the country would be required for the war with Spain. Bute was not unwilling to sacrifice Frederick for the sake of peace, and he made a proposition to that effect, in 1761, to the Austrian Court; but Kaunitz, who took the offer for a snare to embroil him with the Court of Versailles, rejected it with the more disdain, as the prospects of the Empress-Queen were then so brilliant that she confidently anticipated the conquest of Silesia.[1] Nay, so sure was she of an easy victory, that she reduced her army by 20,000 men. Frederick's own dominions were exhausted, and he knew not where to look for help. The only gleam of hope arose from the uncertain expectation of Turkish aid. He had negotiated a treaty with the Porte and with the Khan of Tartary, and he was not without hopes that they might be induced to make a diversion in his favour by invading Hungary. But such an expectation was little more than the straw clutched by a drowning man. Frederick's situation seemed truly desperate. He expressed his gloomy forebodings, his almost utter despair, in his correspondence with the Marquis d'Argens at this period; thoughts of suicide again took possession of his mind, and he is said to have

[1] Garden, t. iv. p. 194; Frederick II. *Guerre de Sept Ans.* ch xiii.; Schlosser, *Gesch. des 17ten Jahrh.* B. ii. S. 396 f.

carried about with him the poison which was to end his miseries.[1] But in this extremity of misfortune he was rescued by the death of the Russian Empress, Elizabeth, January 5th, 1762; an event which more than compensated him for the change of ministry in England. Abandoned to sensual indulgence of every kind, Elizabeth fell a victim to her intemperance. Her extravagance was as unbounded as her idleness and aversion to business. She is said to have left between 15,000 and 16,000 dresses, few of which had been worn more than once, besides whole chest-loads of ribands and silk stockings. She would neglect all business for months together, and could with difficulty be persuaded to affix her signature even to letters of necessary politeness to the highest potentates.[2]

The change of policy adopted by the Czar, Peter III., after his accession, was the result of private friendship, just as Elizabeth's hostility to Frederick had been the effect of personal hatred, without any regard to objects of State policy. Peter, who carried his admiration of Frederick, and of everything Prussian, to a ridiculous extent, communicated his aunt's death to Frederick in an autograph letter, written on the very evening that it occurred, and desired a renewal of their friendship.[3] He also ordered an immediate suspension of hostilities between the Russian and Prussian armies. Peter had formed the design of recovering that part of Sleswick and Holstein which Denmark had gained through the Northern War; for which purpose he meant to employ the troops opposed to the Prussians. A truce with Prussia was accordingly signed at Stargard, in Pomerania, March 16th, 1762, and on May 5th a formal peace was concluded at St. Petersburg, by which the Czar promised to restore, within two months, all the Prussian territories which had been conquered.[4] It was also agreed that a treaty for an alliance should be prepared, the conditions of which are not known, except that each Power was to aid the other with 15,000 men. Lord Bute had endeavoured to prevent this alliance by proposing to the Czar to choose for himself any part of Prussia that he might desire.[5]

Sweden, which had suffered nothing but losses in her war with

[1] Preuss, *Lebensgesch. Friedrichs II.* B. ii. S. 315.

[2] She left the reply to Louis XV.'s announcement of the birth of his grandson unsigned for three years! Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* B. ii. S. 406.

[3] *Biographie Peters III.* B. ii. S. 38 f. ap. Stenzel, B. v. S. 289.

[4] Wenck, t. iii. p. 299.

[5] Lord Dover, *Life of Frederick II.* vol. ii. p. 259.

Prussia, followed the example of Russia in reconciling herself with that country. The war had cost Sweden, the poorest country in Europe, eight million dollars. Adolphus Frederick, had he been so inclined, might easily have overthrown the ruling oligarchy, to which the Czar Peter was hostile; but feelings of piety and honour led him to respect the oath which he had taken, and he contented himself with working on its fears. The conduct of the negotiations was intrusted to the Queen, Frederick II.'s sister. An armistice was agreed to, April 7th, followed by the Peace of Hamburg, May 22nd, by which everything was replaced in the same state as before the war.[1] These events enabled Frederick to concentrate his forces in Saxony and Silesia. He had not only got rid of the Russians as opponents, but even expected their friendly help; but in this hope he was disappointed by another revolution. Peter was deposed through a conspiracy organized by his own consort (July 9th), who mounted the throne in his stead with the title of Catharine II.[2] In the manifest which she published on her accession, dated June 28th (O.S.), she charged her husband, among other things, with dishonouring Russia by the peace which he had made with her bitterest enemy, and Frederick, therefore, could only expect that she would revert to the policy of Elizabeth.[3] But Catharine, the daughter of a Prussian General, born at Stettin, and married into the Russian Imperial family through the influence of Frederick, was not hostilely inclined towards her native land; and the King's alarm at her manifest was soon assuaged by a communication that she intended to observe the peace with him, but to withdraw the Russian troops from his service. Frederick, however, persuaded the Russian General, Czernischeff, to remain by him with his corps for three days after the receipt of this notice; and during this interval, aided by the support which he derived from their presence—for though they took no part in the action, Daun, being ignorant of their recall, was compelled to oppose an equal number of men to them—he drove the Austrians from the heights of Burkersdorf. Two or three months afterwards he took the important town of Schweidnitz (October 9th), when 9,000 Austrians surrendered themselves prisoners of war. This event closed the campaign in Silesia. Prince Henry had succeeded in maintaining himself in

[1] Martens, t. i. p. 12; Wenck, t. iii. p. 307.

[2] We shall return to this subject in a subsequent chapter.

[3] *Biographie Peters III.* B. ii. S. 64, ap. Stenzel, B. v. S. 300; Hermann. *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 288. The date of the revolution, and consequently of the manifest, is erroneously given by Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* S. 428, 431

Saxony; and, on October 29th, he defeated the Austrians and the army of the Empire at Freiburg.

In Western Germany, Prince Ferdinand had also been, on the whole, successful. He drove the French from a strong position which they had taken up near Cassel; and though the Hanoverians were defeated at Friedberg, August 30th, they succeeded in taking Cassel, October 31st. This was the last operation of the war in this quarter, hostilities being terminated by the signing of the preliminaries of peace, November 3rd. But before we describe the negotiations for it we must advert to the war with Spain.

Portugal had been forced into the war through the threats of the Bourbon Courts. Joseph I. now occupied the throne of that Kingdom. John V. died in 1750, and Joseph, then a minor, was left under the guardianship of his mother, the Queen Dowager, an Austrian Princess. During this period Sebastian Joseph of Carvalho and Melo, better known afterwards in European history as the Marquis of Pombal, acquired a complete ascendency over the minds both of the young King and his mother, and continued many years to administer the affairs of Portugal with absolute authority. He had established his influence through his wife, the Austrian Countess Daun, a daughter of Marshal Daun, and a friend and confidante of the Queen. Pombal introduced many searching reforms both in Church and State, which he carried through with an arbitrary despotism more resembling a revolutionary reign of terror than the administration of a constitutional minister.[1] Like Charles XI. of Sweden, he impoverished the nobles by revoking all the numerous grants made to them by the Crown in the Portuguese possessions in Asia, Africa, and America, for which he granted but very slender compensation. Those who ventured to oppose his measures were treated with the greatest harshness and cruelty; every lonely tower, every subterranean dungeon, was filled with State prisoners. His enlightened principles formed a strange contrast to the despotic manner in which he enforced them. He abolished the abuses of the middle ages by methods which seemed fitted only for that period, and proceeded in his work of reform regardless alike of civil and ecclesiastical law. He gave a signal proof of his severity after the terrible earthquake which, in 1755, shook Lisbon to its foundations. Upwards of 30,000 persons are said

[1] Respecting Pombal, see Jagemann, *Das Leben Sebastian Josephs von Carvalho und Melo, Markis von Pombal, &c.* (Dessau, 1782); Moore, *Life of the Marquis of Pombal*, London, 1814; Smith, *Memoir of Marquis of Pombal*, 1843.

to have perished in that calamity; thousands more, deprived of all employment, wandered about homeless and starving; the Government stores were opened for their relief, and contributions poured in from all parts of Europe. It was not one of the least dreadful features of this terrible catastrophe that hundreds of wretches availed themselves of the confusion to plunder and commit all sorts of violence. Pombal put an end to these excesses in the most summary manner. Guards were stationed at every gate and in every street, and those who could not satisfactorily account for any property found upon them, were hanged upon the spot. Gallowses were to be seen in every direction amid the ruins filled with the dead and dying. Between 300 and 400 persons are said to have been hanged in the space of a few days.

Perhaps the most searching and salutary of Pombal's reforms were those which regarded the Church. He abolished the annual *autos de fé*, abridged the power of the Inquisition, and transferred the judgment of accused persons to civil tribunals. He especially signalized himself by his hostility to the Jesuits, as will be recorded in another chapter. The weak and superstitious Joseph was by nature fitted to be the slave and tool of the Romish Church; it was only the still greater awe inspired by Pombal, combined with fears for his own life, that induced him to banish the Jesuits. The King had formed an adulterous connection with the wife of the Marquis of Tavora. During the sojourn of the Court at Belem, while Joseph was supposed to be occupied with affairs of State in the apartments of his Minister, he would steal out to visit his mistress. The Duke of Aveiro, head of the family of Tavora, felt, or pretended to feel, indignant at the dishonour of his kindred, which, however, had been quietly endured several years, and laid a plot against the King's life. The story is involved in considerable mystery, and political motives were probably mixed up in the plot. However this may be, several desperadoes were placed in ambush at three different spots of the road traversed by the King in his secret visits; and, on September 3rd, 1758, while Joseph was proceeding *incognito* to the house of the Marchioness in the carriage of his friend Texeira, an attempt was made upon his life. The Duke of Aveiro himself fired the first shot at the coachman without effect. The coachman turned back, and thus avoided the other ambushes; but those in the first fired after the carriage, and slightly wounded the King in the shoulder. The members of the Tavora family

were now arraigned and condemned. The old Marchioness of Tavora, mother of the King's mistress, was beheaded; the Duke of Aveiro was broken on the wheel; their servants were either burnt or hanged; and even those distantly connected with the accused were thrown into loathsome dungeons. The young Marchioness alone, who was suspected of having betrayed her mother and relatives, experienced any lenity. As the family of Tavora was closely connected with Malagrida and the Jesuits, Pombal seized the opportunity to involve that society in the accusation, and to procure their banishment from Portugal, though it seems very doubtful whether they were at all connected with the plot. The weak and superstitious King himself was blindly devoted to the Jesuits; Pope Clement XIII. took them under his protection, and Joseph, haunted by the fear of hell, at length consented to their banishment only from the more immediate danger with which, according to his Minister, his life was threatened from their machinations.

Pombal, among his other reforms, had not overlooked the army; but a horde of undisciplined vagabonds, who resembled rather gipsies or bandits than soldiers, cannot be converted all at once into effective troops. Joseph's ragged and hungry soldiers would ask an alms from the passers by, even while they were standing sentinel; nor were their officers much better, though they strove to put on a military swagger. Even had the Portuguese army been better organized, it could apparently have offered but a slender resistance to the military force of Spain, when, early in 1762, Charles III. marched an army to the frontiers of Portugal, and, in conjunction with Louis XV., required Joseph I. to join them in the war against England. They offered to occupy Portugal with a powerful army, to protect it against the vengeance of England; and they required an answer within four days, intimating that they should consider any delay beyond that period as a refusal of their demands. Joseph answered by declaring war against Spain and France, May 18th, 1762; and he applied to England for aid; which Lord Bute, notwithstanding his pacific policy, could not of course refuse. This step was immediately followed by an invasion of Traz os Montes by the Spaniards, who, aided by a French corps, made themselves masters of Miranda, Braganza, Chaves, Almeida, and several other places; but the assistance of an English force, commanded first by Lord Tyrawley, and afterwards by the celebrated German general, the Count of Lippe Schaumburg, and ultimately reinforced by 15,000 men,

under Generals Burgoyne and Lee, turned the scales of fortune in favour of the Portuguese. The Spaniards were not only compelled to evacuate Portugal in the autumn, but the allies even crossed the Spanish frontier and took several places.

Meanwhile the negotiations for a peace between England, France, and Spain were brought to a close by the signing of preliminaries at Fontainebleau, November 3rd.[1] They would have been completed earlier had not Grimaldi, the Spanish Minister, deferred his signature in the hope that the English expedition directed against the Havannah would miscarry. It proved successful, and the British Cabinet consequently raised its demands. Spain, besides the Havannah, had also lost, in her short war with England, Manilla and the Philippine Isles, nine ships of the line, and three frigates, and treasure and merchandize valued at three millions sterling. She had fully realized the proverbial fate of those who interpose in quarrels, and was not inclined to prolong the war, even could she have reckoned on the continued aid of France, for which country peace was become a necessity. France also, in the course of 1761 and 1762, had lost the West India Islands of Dominica, Martinique, Grenada, St. Lucie, and St. Vincent, and in the East Indies, her important settlement of Pondicherry. But the conclusion of a definitive treaty was delayed till the differences between the other belligerents were arranged.

Frederick, who had concluded an armistice with Austria, but not with the Imperialists, resolved to hasten the peace by annoying the Princes of the Empire. In the autumn of 1762 a Prussian corps entered Franconia and Bavaria, took Bamberg, menaced Nuremberg, and pushed on to the very gates of Ratisbon. The Elector of Bavaria, the Bishop of Bamberg, and other Sovereigns now resolved to withdraw their contingents from the army of execution, so that Prince Stolberg, who commanded it, was compelled to negotiate with the Prussian commanders for a suspension of arms.[2] Peace was highly necessary for Prussia; Frederick, therefore, readily listened to the overtures of Baron von Fritsch, a counsellor of the King of Poland, and a congress assembled at Hubertsburg, a hunting seat of Augustus, between Leipsic and Dresden, where the Conferences were opened at the end of December.

The definitive Peace of Paris, between France, Spain, Eng-

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. i. p. 17.
[2] Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. v. S. 508 f.

land, and Portugal, was signed February 10th, 1763.[1] Both France and England abandoned their allies, and neither Austria nor Prussia was mentioned in the treaty. While Bute expressly stipulated that all territories belonging to the Elector of Hanover, the Landgrave of Hesse, and the Count of Lippe Bücheburg should be restored to their respective Sovereigns, he displayed his enmity to the King of Prussia by making no such stipulation with regard to Cleves, Wesel, and Geldern, but simply requiring their evacuation by the French, who were, therefore, at liberty to make them over to Maria Theresa. France ceded to England Nova Scotia, Canada, and the country east of the Mississippi, as far as Iberville. A line drawn through the Mississippi, from its source to its mouth, was henceforth to form the boundary between the possessions of the two nations, except that the town and island of New Orleans were not to be included in this cession. France also ceded the island of Cape Breton, with the isles and coasts of the St. Lawrence, retaining, under certain restrictions, the right of fishing at Newfoundland, and the isles of St. Peter and Miquelon. In the West Indies she ceded Grenada and the Grenadines, and three of the so-called neuter islands, namely, Dominica, St. Vincent, and Tobago, retaining the fourth, St. Lucie. Also in Africa, the river Senegal, recovering Goree; in the East Indies, the French settlements on the coast of Coromandel made since 1749, retaining previous ones. She also restored to Great Britain Natal and Tabanouly, in Sumatra, and engaged to keep no troops in Bengal. In Europe, besides relinquishing her conquests in Germany, she restored Minorca, and engaged to place Dunkirk in the state required by former treaties. Great Britain, on her side, restored Belle Isle, and in the West Indies, Martinique, Guadaloupe, Marie Galante, and La Desirade. Spain ceded to Great Britain Florida and all districts east of the Mississippi, recovering the Havannah and all other British conquests. British subjects were to enjoy the privilege of cutting logwood in the Bay of Honduras. Spanish and French troops were to be withdrawn from all Portuguese territories; and with regard to the Portuguese colonies, matters were to be placed in the same state as before the war. This clause involved the restoration of San Sacramento, which the Spaniards had seized. By way of compensation for the loss of Florida, France, by a private agreement, made over to Spain New Orleans and what remained to her of Louisiana.

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. i. p. 33; Wenck, t. iii. p. 329.

The Peace of Hubertsburg, between Austria, Prussia, and Saxony, was signed February 15th, 1763.[1] Maria Theresa renounced her pretensions to any of the dominions of the King of Prussia, and especially those which had been ceded to him by the Treaties of Breslau and Berlin; and she agreed to restore to Prussia the town and county of Glatz, and the fortresses of Wesel and Geldern. These places, as we have seen, were held by France, between which country and Prussia no particular peace was concluded; but they were restored to Frederick by a Convention between the French general, Langeron, and the Prussian Von Bauer, in March.[2] The Empire was included in the peace, but the Emperor was not even named. It would have been impossible for Frederick, had such been his intention, to invent a more cutting reply to the Emperor's threat of putting him under ban. It was not, however, the King of Prussia's object to humble the Emperor, but merely to avoid the unnecessary complications and delays which his participation would have occasioned. The treaty had two secret articles, by the first of which Frederick promised to give his vote for the Archduke Joseph at the next election of a King of the Romans. The other article regarded the marriage of one of the younger Archdukes with a Princess of Modena, with the expectation of succeeding to that Duchy, which Frederick undertook to forward. In the peace with the Elector of Saxony Frederick engaged speedily to evacuate that Electorate, and to restore the archives, &c.; but he would give no indemnification for losses suffered. The Treaty of Dresden of 1745 was renewed.

Thus, after seven years of carnage, during which, according to a calculation of Frederick's, 886,000 men had perished, everything was replaced, in Europe, precisely in the same state in which it was at the beginning of the war. The political results were, however, considerable. England, instead of France, began to be regarded as the leading Power, and the predominance of the five great States was henceforth established by the success of Prussia. This last result was wholly due to the genius and enterprise of Frederick II., who, in the conduct of the war, displayed qualities which procured for him from his admirers the appellation of *the Great*. Everything in this great struggle depended on his own personal exertions; and it is impossible to overrate the quickness, and, in general, the sureness of his conceptions, the happy audacity of his enterprises, his courage and endurance

[1] Martens, t. i. pp. 61 and 71; Wenck, t. iii. pp. 368 and 380.
[2] Menzel, B. v. S. 510.

under reverses, and the fertility of his resources in extricating himself from them. It will, however, be no derogation to him to allow that his genius must, in all probability, have at last succumbed to superior force but for some fortunate circumstances. These were, the wretched organization of the French armies, the want of cordial co-operation on the part of the Russians, the desire of the Austrians in the last years of the war to spare their troops, and, finally, the opportune death of the Empress Elizabeth.

The part played in the war by the Empress-Queen, though unfortunate in the result, can hardly be regarded with disapprobation, as her efforts were directed to recover what was lawfully her own. But the conduct of France, Sweden, Saxony, and Spain, and especially of France, must be condemned as a political blunder. With regard to England, the expediency of plunging into a continental war for the sake of the Hanoverian Electorate alone may well admit of question. It should, however, be remembered that the struggle also concerned the balance of European power, and that the honour and dignity of the King were in some degree at stake. And it must be admitted that, after once engaging in the contest, England, under the counsels of Bute, acted no very honourable part in abandoning her ally the King of Prussia. The Peace was highly unpopular in England, and Bute resigned soon after its conclusion.

CHAPTER XLIX.

DURING the period which elapsed between the Peace of Paris and the first French revolution, the affairs of Eastern and Western Europe offer but few points of contact and connection. The alliance between France and Austria, and the Bourbon family compact, helped to maintain peace upon the Continent, and thus the only war among the Western nations was a maritime one between France, Spain, and England. The affairs of Eastern Europe, on the other hand, were assuming a high degree of importance, through the wars and intrigues of Russia, now rapidly assuming the dimensions of a colossal Power. We shall, therefore, pursue the affairs of these groups of nations separately in the following chapters.

We have already briefly alluded to the revolution which placed Catharine II. upon the throne of Russia. Peter III. owed his downfall to two causes; he had lost the affections both of his subjects and of his wife. Peter was, on the whole, a good-natured well-meaning man, but wholly unfit to govern either a nation or a household. He lost his throne and his life chiefly through his want of tact and knowledge of the world. The slave of passion and caprice, the sport of every impulse to a degree which caused the soundness of his intellect to be suspected, he took no pains to conceal his feelings. He openly displayed his contempt for the manners of the Russians and the creed of their Church; and as he had not that strength of character which had enabled Peter the Great to triumph over the prejudices of his subjects, he became at once both hated and despised. Yet it was no difficult task to govern the Russians. His predecessor Elizabeth had sat securely on her throne, though she utterly neglected all business, and abandoned herself to the most profligate extravagance, and the vilest sensuality. Peter, on the contrary, began his reign with some measures really good in themselves, but unwelcome because they had not the true Russian stamp. Although Elizabeth's clemency has been praised, she had banished 80,000 persons to

languish in Siberia.[1] Most of these, except common criminals, were recalled by Peter, and among them Biron, the former Duke of Courland, Marshal Münnich, and L'Estocq. He forbade the use of torture and abolished the Secret Chancery, a terrible inquisition of police. He enlarged the privileges of the nobles, permitted them to travel, or even to enter foreign service without forfeiting their national rights; and he did away with all monopolies. But it was the reforms which he attempted in the army and the Church which proved most dangerous to himself. He dismissed Elizabeth's costly body-guard, converted his own Holstein Cuirassiers into a regiment of horse-guards, and ordered that all the rest of the army should be clothed and disciplined after the Prussian fashion. Still more hazardous were his innovations in the Church. A Lutheran himself, he abolished at his Court the observance of the Greek fasts, and openly neglected most of the established usages of that religion. He endeavoured to suppress the use of images, candles, and other external rites, and to reform the long, patriarchal beards, and distinctive habits of the clergy. These attacks afforded that Order a handle to excite the populace against him; but Peter's real offence had been his beneficial attempt to reduce their enormous incomes by confiscating the possessions of the convents.

As he thus estranged from him the affections of his people, so he had long before alienated those of his wife. The union had never been a happy one. Catharine had lived on ill terms with her husband ever since their marriage, in spite of the attempts of Frederick II. to reconcile them. They had each their paramours. Peter's favourite mistress was Elizabeth Woronzoff, a woman of vulgar, unprepossessing appearance, and ordinary mind. On the anniversary of his birthday, February 21st, 1762, he had insulted his wife by compelling her to decorate this creature with the Order of Catharine. The Empress, on her side, was no model of domestic virtue. Her son, Paul Petrowitsch, the heir of the Russian throne, was, as we have said, undoubtedly the offspring of Soltikoff. Ever since 1755 she had lived apart from her husband, and had indulged herself in criminal amours. Even during the lifetime of the Empress Elizabeth she had conspired against her husband with the chancellor, Bestuscheff; and after Peter's accession it seemed unavoidable that one should fall. As he had

[1] These wretches were compelled to change their names before their departure, and swear never to resume them. Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 178.

threatened to dismiss her, Catharine resolved to anticipate him, and her character enabled her to accomplish his ruin.

Catharine was, in many respects, the reverse of her husband. She possessed great talent and many accomplishments; while a certain geniality had, in spite of her profligacy, procured her friends and admirers, not only in Russia, but also in Germany and France. Instead of offending her future subjects by shocking their prejudices, she had striven to conciliate their good-will by conforming to them. She learnt their language, adopted their customs, and scrupulously adhered to all their religious observances.[1] Secure of popularity, she laid the plot of that tragedy of lust and blood which recalls the worst days of the Roman Empire. Her chief instruments were the Princess Dashkoff, sister of Peter's mistress, and the five brothers Orloff. The Princess, then only nineteen years of age, possessed a genius for intrigue equal to that of Catharine herself, whose frivolity and taste for French literature she shared. Gregory Orloff, one of the five brothers engaged in the conspiracy, was distinguished by his handsome person, and had long been Catharine's lover. Odard, a Piedmontese *littérateur*, contributed much to the success of the plot, which was also communicated to the Count Panin, subsequently Catharine's Minister. But one of its most zealous supporters was Setschin, Archbishop of Novgorod; who incited the multitude of *popes* or priests in his jurisdiction against the "profane" Emperor. The existence of the conspiracy was widely known; even Frederick II. had acquainted the Czar with it; but the careless Peter listened to no warnings. Fearful of discovery, Dashkoff and the Orloffs compelled Catharine to give the signal of execution. Peter was then living at Oranienbaum, Catharine at Peterhof, two residences at some distance from St. Petersburg. Early in the morning of July 9th, 1762, Catharine repaired to the capital, and caused the soldiers, who had been bribed, to take an oath of allegiance to her. The Senate followed the example of the soldiery in declaring Peter III. deposed, and recognizing Catharine II. in his place. She was proclaimed in the principal church, by the Archbishop of Novgorod, sole Empress; while her son Paul was recognized only as her successor. Ignorant of all these events, Peter had gone in the morning to Peterhof to celebrate there the festival of Peter and Paul, and expecting

[1] Frederick II. thus characterized Catharine to Count von Finkenstein: "The Empress has much wit, no religion, and the inclinations of her predecessor (Elizabeth), together with her religious hypocrisy." Preuss, B. ii. S. 328.

to find his wife. When informed by a secret message of the proceedings in the capital, his presence of mind entirely forsook him. At length, by the advice of Marshal Münnich, who, with one or two others, alone remained faithful to him, he embarked on board his yacht, and proceeded to Cronstadt, in the hope of securing that important fortress. But Catharine had anticipated him. The commandant and garrison, who had been gained by the Empress, threatened to fire on the yacht, which so alarmed Peter that he hid himself in the lowest hold of the vessel. Münnich now attempted to persuade him to sail to Revel, go on board a man-of-war, proceed to Pomerania, and place himself at the head of the army, which, as we have said, was preparing to invade Denmark. But Peter had not the courage requisite for such a step. He listened in preference to the advice of his suite, who recommended him to return to Oranienbaum and effect a reconciliation with Catharine. Here he wrote a cowardly and submissive letter to his wife, offering to divide with her the Imperial power; and as it remained unanswered, he despatched a second in which he threw himself wholly on her mercy, and begged permission to retire to Holstein. The bearer of the last, Ismailhoff, Peter's friend and confidant, was bribed by the promise of high honour and rewards to become the betrayer of his unfortunate master. Ismailhoff, on his return, arrested the Czar; and after persuading, or rather compelling, him to sign a degrading document in which he declared his incompetence to govern, and which he signed only with the title of Duke of Holstein, brought him in his own custody to Peterhof. Catharine entered St. Petersburg in a sort of triumph. Gregory Orloff rode by her side; and it was evident what functions were reserved for him. Apartments were assigned to him in all the Imperial palaces. He was the first of twelve who successively held this post of favourite in the household of the Empress. But the tragedy was not yet complete. The chief criminals had gone too far to allow Peter to live. He was murdered at a country-house near Peterhof, by Alexis Orloff and some confederates, by whom he was strangled, after the failure of an attempt to poison him in some Burgundy (July 17th). It is to be hoped that Catharine was not privy to this last act; yet it is difficult to reconcile her ignorance of it with her refusal to allow her husband to retire to Holstein. When Alexis Orloff came to announce to her her husband's death, she was amusing a select circle with an entertaining anecdote. Alexis called her aside to relate the news, which she affected to deplore; and after

giving, with great calmness, the necessary orders, she returned to her company, and resumed the anecdote exactly where she had broken off!

Catharine in her public announcement of Peter's death, attributed it to hæmorrhoidal colic; invited all faithful subjects to pray for the repose of his soul, and to regard his unexpected death as the effect of a Divine Providence, pointing out by its unfathomable decrees paths which it alone knew for the good of herself, her throne, and her country. The body of the Czar lay in state in the convent of Alexander Newski, where the people were admitted to view it. The throat, it was observed, was encircled with a much deeper cravat than the Czar had been accustomed to wear.[1] In a hypocritical manifest, dated on the day of her husband's death, Catharine heaped every possible obloquy on his memory, and charged him with a design to murder herself, and deprive her son of the succession.

Apart from her private life, the administration of Catharine II., like that of Cæsar Borgia, was excellent. She introduced an admirable organization both into the Government and the army. Even in the Church she carried through many of those reforms the attempting which had proved her husband's ruin. Towards the end of the year 1762 the ukase of Peter III. was submitted to an ecclesiastical commission, the chief of whom were bribed; the rest were regarded as contemptible. They attempted, in revenge, to excite against the Empress the latent elements of discord. They sought to awaken public sympathy in favour of Ivan VI., the rightful heir of the Russian Crown, who, dethroned in his very cradle, had now been more than twenty years a prisoner (*supra*, p. 111). Peter III., naturally kind-hearted, had visited that unfortunate Prince in his wretched dungeon at Schlüsselburg, and had endeavoured in some degree to alleviate his misfortunes.[2] The malcontent *popes* dispersed abroad a manifest, said to have been drawn up during the last days of Peter III., in which that Sovereign, revealing the guilt of his wife, excluded her son, the Grand Prince Paul, from the succession. The popular discontent began to assume formidable dimensions; the soldiery were infected with it, and everything seemed to promise the outbreak of

[1] Old Field-Marshal Trubetskoi, on approaching the body, involuntarily exclaimed, "Fie, Peter Feodorowitsch, what a thick neckerchief have they given thee!" and, rushing up to the bier, was about to tear it away, when the sentinels drew him back. Hermann, B. v. S. 307.

[2] During this interview Peter directed the miserable prisoner to ask some favour. Ivan requested a little fresh air. He had once enjoyed that luxury through a broken window! He was now, of course, almost a confirmed idiot. Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 273.

a fresh revolution. But Catharine was well served by her police. The soldiers of the guard were forbidden to assemble, except at the special command of their officers; some of the most turbulent were arrested, and either punished with the *knout* or banished to Siberia; fear reduced the remainder to obedience. The secularization of Church property now proceeded without molestation. That measure was even assisted by the Archbishop of Novgorod, although he had delivered a bitter invective against the memory of Peter III. shortly after his death, the chief topic of which was the aggressions of that Prince on the property of the Church. But Catharine had bought the time-serving prelate, and soon after she deposed him; in the just confidence that the contempt which he had incurred with his Order would deprive him of all power to hurt her.[1] It was in consequence of these disturbances and some that followed in 1763, that Ivan VI. lost his life. Well-informed courtiers whispered that he must die; insecure on her still tottering throne, his name was a tower of strength to Catharine's enemies. In the summer of 1764 she undertook a journey to Riga, in order, it was suspected, to have an interview with her former favourite, Count Poniatowski; but more probably that she might escape, by her absence, the suspicion of being privy to Ivan's murder. Before her departure she gave a written order to the two officers who had the custody of Ivan to put him to death in case of any attempt to deliver him from prison. Such an attempt was actually made by Mirowitsch, a lieutenant of the regiment in garrison at Schlüsselburg, and the orders of Catharine were executed. Mirowitsch's motives for this act are enveloped in mystery; but the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that it had been concerted with the Court. He made no attempt to escape, went through his trial with the greatest composure, and was even observed to laugh upon the scaffold. The police had orders to delay the execution till a certain hour, and Mirowitsch confidently expected a reprieve; but his head fell while the smile was still playing on his lips. The death of the deluded tool was necessary to allay the suspicion excited by the enigmatical death of Ivan.[2]

One of Catharine's first political acts after her accession was to assure Frederick V. of Denmark of her peaceful intentions, and to recall from Mecklenburg the Russian troops which Peter had kept in that Duchy with the view of invading the Danish dependencies. Catharine's project of aggrandizement lay nearer home,

[1] Hermann, B. v. S. 310 f. [2] *Ibid.* S. 647 ff.

and she prepared to reinstate Biron as Duke of Courland. After Biron's fall the Duchy had long remained without a head, and was entirely governed by Russia. At length, in 1758, Charles, the third son of Augustus III. of Poland, was invested with it through the influence of the Empress Elizabeth; but neither Peter III. nor Catharine recognized him. Charles defended himself six months against the Russian forces, but was then obliged to yield. Catharine's motive for deposing him was to bring Courland more directly under Russian influence; and she promised in return to mediate the evacuation of Saxony, still held by the Prussian troops. In vain Augustus represented that the matter belonged to the jurisdiction of the King and Republic of Poland; the presence of 15,000 Russian troops in Courland was an all-sufficing answer to this objection.

This proceeding was a mere prelude to that larger drama which Catharine was preparing to exhibit on the theatre of Poland itself. At the very beginning of her reign, the health of the Polish King, Augustus III., promising him but a short tenure of life, she had prepared to interfere in the affairs of that Kingdom at the next election, and with that view had sent Count Kayserlingk as her ambassador to Warsaw. Augustus, who had not visited Poland after the Peace of Hubertsburg, died at Dresden, October 5th, 1763. He was succeeded in the Saxon Electorate by his son, Frederick Christian, who, however, also died in the following December, leaving a minor son, Frederick Augustus, whose election to the Polish Crown was out of the question. Meanwhile, since the death of Augustus III., Poland had fallen into a state of complete anarchy. Two factions contended for the mastery; on one side the Czartorinskis, Oginskis, and Poniatowskis, supported by Russia; on the other the Radzivills and Braniskis, who relied upon the influence of France. Catharine had resolved to place the Polish Crown on the head of Count Stanislaus Poniatowski, one of her former lovers;[1] a choice, however, not dictated by any recollections of that kind, but by the cool and politic advice of Count Panin, her Foreign Minister, who saw, in the weak and courtier-like character of Stanislaus, all those qualities which would render him the fitting tool of the interested designs of

[1] Count Poniatowski had formerly been Polish Ambassador to the Russian Court. One day Peter, having detected him, in the disguise of a barber, in the garden of his wife at Oranienbaum, caused him to be arrested, brought him before his courtiers and companions, and after abusing and ridiculing him, procured his dismissal to Poland. Frightened, however, by the anger of Catharine, the complaisant husband endeavoured to obtain his recall, but the Empress Elizabeth would not consent. *Biographie Peters III.* Th. i. S. 121, ap. Hermann, B. v. S. 154.

Russia. But as this plan was likely to be opposed by Austria and France, Catharine resolved to support it by a closer alliance with Prussia.

The conduct of Frederick II. at this juncture was most important to the future prospects and policy of Europe. He had to choose whether he should aid the rising flood of Russian might, which threatened to overwhelm the surrounding nations, or whether he should endeavour to set a dam to it by forming a close alliance with the Poles. At the beginning of the Seven Years' War, Frederick, in a note addressed to the Poles, had declared that the power of the House of Brandenburg and the freedom of the Polish Republic went hand in hand, that the fall of one would certainly draw after it the destruction of the other.[1] The time seemed now to be arrived when the sincerity of this declaration was to be put to the proof. Several of the Polish magnates were inclined to elect Prince Henry of Prussia for their Sovereign, and Frederick was solicited to support their choice.[2] But other considerations now prevailed with the Prussian King. The election of Prince Henry would have obliged him to change his religion—a step to which Frederick was averse, not from piety, but pride. He had already, in the year 1744, declined on this very ground the marriage of his sister Ulrica with the Grand Duke Peter, heir of the Russian Throne,[3] and had substituted for her the daughter of his general, Prince Christian of Anhalt-Zerbst; that very Catharine II. whose friendship and goodwill was now, in so unforeseen and surprising a manner, of such unspeakable importance to him! Prince Henry, besides, was childless, and his acceptance of the throne of Poland could only have assured the union of the two kingdoms during the remainder of his lifetime. But Frederick's conduct was probably determined principally by the state of his foreign relations. The election of his brother as King of Poland would, in all probability, involve him in a lengthened war with Russia, and in such a struggle to whom could he look for help? Louis XV. opposed him, Maria Theresa hated and suspected him, George III. and Lord Bute had deserted him. A Russian alliance, on the contrary, not only assured him the support of that Power, but, by serving to maintain the anarchy of Poland, held out to him the prospect of eventual aggrandizement at the expense of that unhappy country.

[1] Hertzberg, *Recueil de Déductions*, t. i. p. 271.

[2] De La Roche-Aymon, *Vie privée, milit., et polit. du Prince Henri de Prusse*, ap. Menzel, B. vi. S. 37.

[3] *Ibid.* B. v. S. 376.

The alliance was effected through Frederick's complaisance in allowing Catharine to dispose of the Polish Throne. On April 11th, 1764, a treaty was concluded at St. Petersburg, which, during the remainder of Frederick's reign, determined the political connection between Russia and Prussia. Ostensibly, it was merely a defensive alliance for a term of eight years, but its real character was determined by certain secret conventions. The Empress and the King engaged by a secret article to prevent Poland from being deprived of its elective right, and rendered an hereditary kingdom, or an absolute government—stipulations which, though agreeable to the majority of the Poles themselves, deprived them of the only chance of maintaining their existence as an independent nation. The contracting Powers also agreed to protect the Polish *dissidents*, or religious dissenters, against the oppressions of the dominant Catholic Church. By a secret Convention, signed on the same day, it was further arranged that the election should fall on a *Piast*, or member of one of the native Polish families; the person selected for that honour being Count Stanislaus Poniatowski, *Stolnic* (*dapifer*, or *seneschal*) of Lithuania.[1] The election thus resolved on was finally carried out by force of arms. In the spring of 1764 the Radzivills and Braniski, the crown grand-general, appeared at the head of an army, and expelled the Russians from Graudenz; but the Czartorinskis, uncles of Stanislaus Poniatowski, placing themselves at the head of a Confederation, and assisted by Russian troops, drove the opposing faction from the field, and Stanislaus was then chosen King, September 7th, 1764. To secure his election, 10,000 Russians had marched to Warsaw, while Prussian troops made demonstrations on the frontiers. Only 4,000 electors were present on the plain of Wola, about a twentieth part of those who sometimes appeared; and in order to avoid the *liberum veto*, the Elective Diet was converted into a Confederation, which was bound by a majority.[2]

The policy pursued by Russia and Prussia in order to destroy Polish nationality resembled that adopted by France and Sweden at the Peace of Westphalia for the destruction of the German Empire. But though the Emperor retained at last little more than an empty title, the German nation survived in its pristine vigour, because two great and powerful monarchies had arisen in the bosom of the Confederation, which were able to assert them-

[1] Wenck, t. iii. p. 481, and p. 487; Martens, t. i. p. 89 (without the secret articles); Frédéric II., *Mém. de* 1763–1775, ch. i.

[2] Rulhière, *Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne*, t. ii. p. 254; Frédéric, *Œuvres*, t. vi. p. 13.

selves against the surrounding nations, and even to take their place among the leading Powers of Europe. But a kingdom like Poland, in which were preserved all the abuses of the middle ages, and which possessed no centralized power, could not exist in the neighbourhood of several powerful and despotic monarchies. We have already briefly adverted to these abuses, and we shall here add, from the account of a contemporary observer, a few more details respecting the state of Poland immediately before its first dismemberment.[1] A multitude of serfs, estimated at about six millions, formed two-thirds of the nation. They differed but little from the brutes; lived in dirt, misery, and ignorance, possessed no property of their own, and if a single crop failed, died by thousands of starvation. No change of government could render their condition worse than it was. The remaining third of the nation was composed of the clergy, the great lords or magnates, the middling and smaller nobility, the lawyers, the citizens, and the Jews. The clergy were estimated at about 600,000, of whom some thirty had immense revenues; the rest were poorly off, lived in the idleness of convents, were, in general, profoundly ignorant, and employed themselves only in caballing. The magnates or great nobles numbered some 120 persons, of whom four or five might be called dominant families, princes with large revenues, numerous adherents, and even standing armies. The middling nobility comprised between 20,000 and 30,000 persons, all in tolerable circumstances, who lived retired in their villages. Their only pursuit was to amass money and oppress their peasantry, or serfs; their only ambition to shine in a Diet, or appear among the clients of the great. The small nobility, estimated at 1,300,000 souls, may be said to have composed the real body of the nation—the Polish people. But what were they? A mass of persons without property or profession, of an ignorance amounting to stupidity, the necessary slaves of the great lords, yet claiming the quality of gentlemen from their privilege of pronouncing the *veto*, of talking about their liberties, and getting drunk whenever they had the means; yet often reduced to mendicancy or to serve their more fortunate equals. The military was composed of only a few thousand brave, but ill-disciplined men. The magistracy and lawyers were also few in number, and had but a very imperfect legal education. The class of citizens, or burgesses, was almost an imaginary one. It

[1] See the anonymous *Memoir*, entitled *Les Paradoxes, ouvrage plus vrai qu'utile*, ap. Hermann, *Gesch Russlands*, B. v. Anhang ii. 21, p. 591 ff. The author describes himself as "un ami des hommes, qui s'occupe à leur faire du bien, qui cherche à rectifier leurs travers, et qui étudie à rectifier les siens."

consisted of some 400 or 500 merchants, established in the four or five walled towns of the Kingdom, and 40,000 or 50,000 artizans, as tailors, shoemakers, weavers, &c., dispersed through the towns, or rather hamlets, where they were exposed, almost as much as the peasants, to the brutality of the nobles. Lastly came the Jews, estimated at near a million. A part of these conducted almost the whole traffic of the country, borrowed at a high rate of interest the money of ecclesiastics and nobles, and generally finished by a fraudulent bankruptcy. The remaining portion of this order were keepers of inns, public-houses, &c., and formed the bulk of the population of the towns. The Jews, the clergy, the *tiers état*, which, as we have seen, was quite insignificant, and foreigners residing in Poland, were alone liable to taxation, from which the nobles claimed the privilege of exemption.[1]

A nation which possessed neither a middle class, nor commerce, nor a fixed revenue, nor a regular army, nor fortresses and artillery; whose National Assembly could be nullified by the *veto* of a single wrong-headed or designing member, or overawed by a turbulent Confederation; whose King possessed no real power, since the heads of the army, the law, the finances, and the political government of the State—that is, the Grand General of the Crown, the Grand Chancellor, the Grand Treasurer, and the Grand Marshal—were responsible, not to him, but to the anarchical assembly before described, carried in itself all the elements of dissolution. Such a catastrophe had been foretold a century before by John Casimir, the last King of Poland of the House of Wasa, in an address to the Diet in 1661, in which, adverting to the intestine divisions of the Kingdom, he predicted, in a remarkable manner, its future dismemberment by Muscovy, Austria, and the House of Brandenburg.[2] Its anomalous constitution, a union of republican and monarchical forms, was fatal to its existence.

The religious dissensions, too, which prevailed in Poland were not among the least of the causes which contributed to its ruin, and served, indeed, as a pretext for effecting it. Under the name of *dissidents* were comprised both the members of the Reformed Church and a large number of Greek Christians, inhabiting the Lithuanian provinces, formerly subject to the Russian Empire. Calvinism had rapidly spread among a turbulent and republican nobility, and before the close of the sixteenth century, Poland

[1] Essen's *Bericht*, ap. Hermann, B. v. S. 553 Anm.

[2] See Lunigii, *Orationes procerum Europæ*, ap. Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xiv. p. 7.

counted a million Protestants. At first the dissentients had enjoyed an equality of civil rights with their Catholic fellow-countrymen. These rights, however, were gradually restricted; and towards the beginning of the eighteenth century, and especially after the time of Charles XII., who had indiscreetly attempted to render Protestantism the dominant religion, persecution became more vigorous and methodical. A Diet in 1717 ordered the destruction of all Protestant churches built since the Swedish invasion, and forbade the Reformed worship in all places where it had not existed before that event. In 1724 the intolerance of the Jesuits produced a bloody persecution at Thorn, which had nearly involved the Republic in a war with the guarantors of the Peace of Oliva. The decrees of a Diet in 1733, confirmed by another in 1736, excluded Dissenters from all offices and dignities.

The Dissenters availed themselves of the election of Stanislaus Augustus to invoke the protection of the Czarina. Nothing could be more acceptable to Catharine than such a pretext for meddling in the affairs of Poland. In a note presented by her Ambassador, Count Kayserlingk, and her Minister, Prince Repnin, which was backed by another from Frederick II., she demanded that the dissentients should be allowed the free exercise of their religion, and enjoy the same political rights as Catholics. By thus interfering in favour of liberty of conscience, as well as by helping to maintain the Elective Monarchy, Russia and Prussia seemed to be acting in accordance with the enlightened spirit of the age, when, in fact, their object only was to serve their own purposes by keeping up the anarchy in Poland. Toleration was to be established by 40,000 bayonets. But the Diet assembled in 1765, instead of lending themselves to the views of the Empress, renewed, in a moment of enthusiasm and reaction against Russian domination, all the most objectionable constitutions against Dissenters.

Our space permits us only briefly to indicate some of the leading events which preceded the partition of Poland.[1] The King, by his

[1] Among the principal works on this subject may be mentioned: Rulhière, *Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne;* Ferrand, *Hist. des trois Démembremens de la Pologne* (a continuation of the preceding work); Görtz, *Mémoires et Actes authentiques relatifs aux négociations qui ont précédés le partage de la Pologne;* Frédéric II., *Mém. depuis la Paix de Hubertsburg;* Dohm, *Denkwürdigkeiten meiner Zeit*, Lemgo, 1814; *Souvenirs du Comte de * * * sur le premier Démembrement de la Pologne*, in the *Lettres particulières du baron de Viosménil sur les affaires de la Pologne*, p. 87 sqq. An accurate and valuable account of all the circumstances which preceded the first partition of Poland, from the election of Stanislaus in 1764 till its final consummation, chiefly compiled from the MS. despatches of Von Essen, the Saxon Minister at Warsaw at that period, will be found in Hermann's *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 381-556.

weakness and vacillation, lost the confidence of all parties. He had at first lent himself to the Russian plans in favour of the dissidents; but finding that the carrying of them through the Diet would be incompatible with the schemes which he had formed for extending the power of the Crown, he broke with Prince Repnin, the Russian Minister at Warsaw, and joined his uncles the Czartorinskis. These Princes, after the election of their nephew, had endeavoured to introduce some order into the State. They wished to abolish the *liberum veto*, to establish a regular system of taxation, and to put the army on an adequate footing; and they formed a Confederation to carry out their views; but although Stanislaus Augustus, in the Diet which met in October, 1766, declared himself against the Russian plans in favour of the dissidents, yet the anti-Russian party suspected his sincerity, and refused to give him their confidence. Catharine, on the other hand, enraged that her creature should presume to show any will of his own, resolved, not indeed to dethrone him, but to leave him nothing but an empty title. Defeated in her projects by the Diet above mentioned, she resolved to effect them in another way. Her chief instrument in this work was Prince Charles Radzivill, a man of great authority in Lithuania, whom she had bought. Through his influence, and with the aid of Russian gold, no fewer than 178 Confederations were formed in Poland in 1767. These consisted not only of dissidents, but also of malcontent Catholics, who were led away with the idea that the King was to be deposed; but were perhaps more governed by Russian money than by any political or patriotic views. These Confederations, which are said to have numbered 80,000 members, were united into one at Radom, a town in the Palatinate of Sandomierz, under Prince Radzivill and Brzotowski as Marshals, June 23rd. According to Polish customs, a general Confederation thus formed exercised a sort of irresponsible dictatorship. Laws and magistrates were silent in its presence; the King, the Senate, the holders of the highest offices and dignities, were amenable to its jurisdiction; persons who refused to join it were liable to have their property confiscated. Having effected this object, Prince Repnin now threw off the mask. A manifest was laid before the general Confederation of quite a different tenour from the propositions made to the separate ones. In these little had been said about the dissidents; but now a complete political equality was demanded for them; and the assembly was still further disgusted by the intimation that they were to request the Russian guarantee

to the laws and constitutions which they were to promulgate. As they had also discovered that Russia would not consent to the dethronement of the King, they refused to sign the Act of Confederation; whereupon the Russian Colonel, Carr, surrounded the assembly with his troops, and would permit nobody to depart till the Act had been signed. To the 178 Marshals of the various Confederations views of self-interest were also held out, and thus partly by force, partly by persuasion, they were induced to take an oath of fidelity to the King, and to invite his accession to the Confederation.

Repnin now ruled despotically. Under his auspices an extraordinary Diet was opened, October 4th, 1767, whose decisions, as it was held under the form of a Confederation, were regulated by a majority. Repnin arranged its proceedings in daily conferences with the Primate, Prince Radzivill, the Grand Treasurer of the Crown, and the King. The Bishops of Cracow and Kioff, the Palatine of Cracow and his son, and a few others who seemed inclined to oppose the proceedings, were seized and carried into the interior of Russia. A delegation or committee of sixty members, and another smaller one of fourteen, were now appointed; and the Diet was prorogued to receive their report. The smaller Delegation was empowered to make binding resolutions by a majority of votes, and thus eight men could decide upon the future fate and constitution of Poland, although by the will of Russia and Prussia the *liberum veto*—in other words, *unanimity* in the proceedings of the Diet—was to remain the fundamental principle of the Constitution! Repnin governed all the proceedings of the Delegation, and the report laid before the Diet contained only such matters as had been approved of by him.[1] On March 5th, 1768, the King and the two Marshals of the Confederation signed an Act comprizing, in the name of the nation, the resolutions of the Diet, and the Confederation was then dissolved. The result of their deliberations was incorporated in a treaty with Russia, and two separate Conventions, which established the future Constitution of Poland. The treaty confirmed the Peace of Moscow

[1] The following anecdote will show his absolute authority. A resolution had been passed in the smaller delegation which almost annihilated the authority of the Papal nuncio in Poland. Catharine disapproved of it, and Repnin, in the greater delegation, drawing a paper from his pocket, said, with an air of condescension, "Gentlemen, here is a project of the committee, annulling all the authority of the Pope in this Kingdom, but I have the commands of my Sovereign to say that she does not insist upon it. With your permission, therefore, I destroy it:" and, tearing it in pieces, he handed them to one of the most zealous sticklers for the Pope, saying, "Receive from my hands these fragments of a project, and preserve them as a relic." Essen's *Berichte*, ap. Hermann, B. v. S. 426.

of 1686. By the first separate Act,[1] the Roman Catholic religion was made dominant in Poland. It was provided that the King must be a Papist; that the Queen could not be crowned unless she belonged to the Romish communion; that any Pole who abandoned that creed after the establishment of this Act, should incur the penalty of banishment. But, on the other hand, the Protestant Confederation was recognized as legal; Dissenters were authorized to retain the churches and foundations of which they were in possession; and were to be admitted into the Senate and public offices on the same footing as Papists. The second separate Act contained the cardinal laws of the Republic, as settled with Prince Repnin. The *liberum veto* was retained, so far as it subserved the purposes of foreign intervention. For though, during the first three weeks of a Diet, during which only economical questions were discussed, a *majority* of votes was to decide, yet, during the last three weeks, which were devoted to affairs of State policy, it was required that the votes should be unanimous. Some really good regulations were, however, introduced. Thus the wilful murder of a serf by a noble was no longer to be redeemable with money, but was to be punished capitally.

These proceedings excited great discontent among the Poles, which was increased by the brutality of Repnin. The nation became convinced that the King had sold himself and them, that he had always been the secret ally of Russia, and that the apparent breach between the Courts of St. Petersburg and Warsaw was a mere sham and delusion. Radzivill received the reward of his treachery in being restored to his Palatinate, from which he had been driven in the Czartorinskis, as well in as large sums of money. The fanaticism of the populace was excited by the priests, who gave out that Russia, in accord with King Stanislaus, intended to abolish the Roman Catholic religion. The discontent was fanned by France. Choiseul, the French Minister, endeavoured, but without success, to detach Frederick II. from Russia; but he succeeded in raising the Poles, and at length in persuading the Porte to enter into a Russian war. In March, 1768, a Confederation was formed by the Polish Catholics in the town of Bar, in Podolia, a Province neighbouring on Turkey, for

[1] The preamble states that it was concluded between the Emperor of Russia, the Kings of Prussia, Denmark, England, and Sweden on the one part, and the King and Republic of Poland on the other. But though it is true that the four Powers named employed their influence in favour of the dissidents, and though their ministers assisted at the sittings of the Commission, the Act was signed only by Prince Repnin and the Polish plenipotentiaries. Wenck, *Codex Jur. Gent., rec.* t. iii. pp. 651, 701; Martens, *Recueil*, t. i. pp. 391, 398.

the purpose of dethroning the King, driving out the Russians, and restoring Polish freedom.[1] The principal leaders were Count Krasinsky, who was elected Marshal, Pulmoski, and Potocki—persons of no great consideration. This Confederation gave rise to others in Great and Little Poland and Lithuania. Even Radzivill himself, a fickle, drunken, and despicable character, was for a while carried away by the stream, and joined one of these associations; but surrendered immediately the Russians appeared before his fortress of Nieswicz. The separate Confederations were finally converted into a general one, which, on account of the Russian troops, held its council abroad; first at Eperies in Hungary, and then at Teschen in Silesia. From this place the deputies of the Confederation betook themselves to the little town of Bielitz, close to the Polish frontiers, and separated only by a small stream from the lordship of Biala, belonging to the Sulkowski family, so that the necessary papers could be signed on Polish ground. France assisted the Confederates with a small subsidy till the fall of the Minister Choiseul, and sent to their aid the afterwards noted Colonel Dumouriez, and some other officers. But she never lent them any effectual help. Almost ten years before, the French Cabinet had contemplated the partition of Poland as highly improbable; and even in the event of its occurrence, had decided that it was not likely to interest France.[2] Although want of discipline and subordination among the Poles, and the disunion which prevailed among their leaders, caused them, in spite of their bravery, to be worsted in almost every rencounter with the Russians; yet the insurrection was found difficult to suppress, and the fate of Poland was postponed a few years longer by a quarrel between Russia and the Porte.

Turkey had now enjoyed a long interval of tranquillity. Sultan Mahmoud I., who reigned above twenty years, though not endowed with great abilities, and entirely governed by his ministers, encouraged the arts of peace.[3] He built numerous mosques, and founded several schools and professorships, as well as four libraries. He encouraged the art of printing, which had been

[1] Rulhière, *Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne*, t. iii. p. 13 sqq.

[2] "Lors même que, contre toute vraisemblance, les quatre puissances (including Turkey) s'arrangeraient pour partager la Pologne, il est encore très-douteux que cet évènement pût intèresser la France." —*Mémoire lu au Conseil 8 mai* 1763, ap. St. Priest, *Partage de la Pologne*.

[3] For this period of Turkish history may be consulted, Tott, *Mém. sur les Turcs et les Tartares; Turkey, its History and Progress*, from the journals and correspondence of Sir James Porter, edited by Sir George Larpent; London, 1854. Sir J. Porter was ambassador at Constantinople from 1747 to 1762.

introduced at Constantinople by a Hungarian renegade; but it had many opponents and made but very slow progress. By granting the Janissaries an exemption from import duties, he induced a large number of them to engage in commerce, and thus rendered them anxious for the tranquillity of the government. These regulations, however, contributed to break the military spirit of the nation, as was but too manifest in its subsequent struggles with Russia. Mahmoud I. died in his fifty-eighth year, December 13th, 1754, while returning from Friday prayers. He was succeeded by his brother, Osman III., whose tranquil reign of two years presents nothing of importance. On his death, December 22nd, 1756, Mustapha III., son of Achmet III., then forty-one years of age, became Sultan and Caliph. Mustapha was an accomplished and energetic Prince, an astrologer and poet, and deeply religious.

The Porte had at first manifested great indifference to the fate of Poland. During the vacancy of the Crown it had contented itself with presenting a moderate note to the Russian Resident, protesting against any interference in the election. When the tumults broke out, Count Vergennes, the French Ambassador to the Porte, endeavoured to incite it in favour of the Polish patriots. Catharine II., stimulated by ambition and the desire of aggrandizement, had not confined her views to Poland. She had also cast her eyes on some of the Turkish provinces, and had marked them out as her future prey; but, so long as the affairs of Poland remained unsettled, she wished to remain at peace with the Porte, and with this view she had bought with large sums the votes of some of the most influential members of the Divan. Hence, though Mustapha himself was inclined for war, the counsels of his ministers were long undecided. The progress of the Russian arms was, however, watched with jealousy and alarm. The incursions of Russian troops across the borders in pursuit of the Poles, and especially the burning by the Russians and Saporogue Cossacks, of Balta, a little town on the frontier of Bessarabia, belonging to the Tartar Khan, excited the anger of the Porte in the highest degree; but it was not till after the taking of Cracow by the Russians that an appeal to arms was decided on. The Mufti gave his long expected Fetwa for war; the Grand Vizier, who had been an advocate of peace, was deposed; and, although Catharine had made apologies, and promised satisfaction for the damages committed by her troops, the new Grand Vizier, after upbraiding Obreskoff, the Russian Resident, with the treacherous conduct of

his mistress in keeping her troops in Poland, caused him to be confined in the Seven Towers.

Sultan Mustapha now made vigorous preparations for war, and assembled a numerous army. But the time of his declaration had been badly chosen. A great part of the Turkish troops were only bound to serve in the summer, and thus six months were spent in inaction, during which the Russians had time to prepare themselves. The Turkish regular troops were no longer very formidable; but the Tartars who inhabited the Crim, and the desolate regions between the Dnieper and Dniester, and even to the Pruth, were numerous and warlike. The Tartars of the Budziac, and the Nogai Tartars, inhabiting the Crimea, were under a Khan who was subject to the Sultan. The reigning Khan was now deposed, and his predecessor, Krim Girai,[1] who was living in banishment, being a bitter foe to the Russians, was recalled, and commissioned to begin the war with his hordes. Early in 1769, supported by 10,000 Sipahis and a few hundred Poles, Krim Girai invaded New Servia, where he committed the most terrible devastations.[2] But soon after his return, this last of the Tartar heroes was poisoned by his Greek physician Siropolo, an emissary of the Prince of Wallachia.

The main Turkish army, under the Grand Vizier Mohammed Emir Pasha, effected little or nothing. The Russians, under Galitzin, were indeed repulsed in two attempts upon Choczim, but Emir Pasha, accused of conducting the war with too little vigour, was recalled and beheaded at Adrianople. His successor, Mustapha Moldawanschi Ali Pasha, was still more unfortunate. After two or three vain attempts to enter Podolia, the Turks were compelled to make a general retreat, and the Russians occupied Moldavia and Wallachia; in which last province a strong Russian party had been formed. An attempt made by a Turkish corps to recover Bucharest, in February, 1770, was frustrated. Romanzoff, who had succeeded Galitzin as commander of the Russians, gained two decisive victories and compelled the Turks to abandon Ismail. By the end of the year the Russians had penetrated into the Crimea. Their arms had also been successful in Asia, where a great part of Armenia, Circassia, and Kabarda had been reduced.

[1] The family of Girai, or Gherai, descended from Zingis Khan, formed a particular dynasty of the Mongols of Kipzak, called the Great Horde, or Golden Horde, which, from 1237 till the end of the fifteenth century, had ruled Russia with a rod of iron. Koch et Schöll, t. xiv. p. 458.

[2] For this war see the *Mémoires* of Baron de Tott, t. ii. De Tott's father was a Hungarian who had fled into Turkey with Ragotski. He himself took refuge in France, and assisted the Turks in this war as an engineer.

Voltaire was at this time endeavouring to awaken a spirit of Phil-hellenism in Frederick and Catharine; he urged them to partition Turkey, and to restore the Greeks to independence. Frederick, however, avowed that he should prefer the town of Dantzic to the Piræus.[1] His dominions were at too great a distance from Greece to enable him to derive any material advantage from such a project. But with Catharine the case was different. Her views had long been directed towards this quarter, and for some years Russian emissaries had been striving to awaken a spirit of revolt among the Greek Christians in all the Turkish provinces. The conquest of Greece is said to have been suggested by a Venetian nobleman to Count Alexis Orloff; and in 1769 Orloff had concluded a formal treaty with the Mainotes and other tribes of the Morea and of Roumelia. He had engaged to supply them with the necessaries of war, and they had promised to rise so soon as the Russian flag should appear on their coasts. Fleets were prepared at Cronstadt, Archangel, and Revel, which, under his conduct, were to attempt the conquest of Constantinople. The British Ministry of that day approved the project, and even signified to the Cabinets of Versailles and Madrid that it should regard as an act of hostility any attempt to arrest the progress of the Russian fleet into the Mediterranean.[2] Choiseul, on the contrary, endeavoured, but without effect, to persuade Louis XV. to ink it, as the only method of reviving the credit of France, both with the Porte and Europe.[3] The first division of the Russian fleet, consisting only of three ships of war and a few transports, with about 500 men on board, appeared off Port Vitolo, near Cape Matapan, towards the end of February, 1770. The Mainotes rose, but no plan of a campaign had been arranged, and the whole affair degenerated into a sort of marauding expedition. Navarino alone seemed for a time likely to become a permanent conquest. But after some fruitless attempts on Modon and Coron, the Russians took their departure towards the end of May, abandoning the Greeks to their fate. They suffered dreadfully at the hands of the Turks for their temerity, and the Morea became a scene of the most frightful devastation. The Russian fleet, under Admiral Spiridoff, which originally consisted of twelve ships of the line, and the same number of frigates, besides smaller vessels, remained in the Mediterranean three or four years; but the only action of

[1] See his correspondence with Voltaire.
[2] Eton's *Survey of the Turkish Empire*, p. 173 sq.
[3] *Politique de tous les Cabinets*, t. ii. Zinkeisen, B. v. S. 929.

any importance which it performed was the burning of the Turkish fleet in the Bay of Chesmeh, near the Gulf of Smyrna, after defeating it off Chios. This victory (July 5th, 1770) was wholly due to the British officers serving in the Russian fleet, namely, Admiral Elphinstone, Captain Greig, and Lieutenant Dugdale, though all the honours and emoluments fell to Orloff. Elphinstone now wished to force the passage of the Dardanelles, and sail to Constantinople, but Orloff prevented him.[1]

These successes awakened the jealousy and alarm of the European Powers. England now recalled her seamen from the Russian service, and proposed her mediation to the Porte, while France offered to supply the Sultan with men-of-war, in consideration of a subsidy. Austria and Prussia, neither of which desired to see Turkey destroyed, were still more nearly interested in the Russo-Turkish war. The Eastern question formed the chief subject of the conferences between Joseph II., who had now ascended the Imperial throne, and Frederick II. of Prussia, in their interviews at Neisse, in Silesia, in August, 1769, and at Neustadt, in Moravia, in September, 1770. A collateral effect of the war was to hasten the partition of Poland. There can be no doubt that, at the interview at Neustadt, where Kaunitz was also present, the necessity was recognized of setting bounds to the advance of Russian power;[2] or rather the main object was, that Russia should not be suffered to aggrandize herself alone, and without the participation of Austria and Prussia. Of this policy Poland was to be the victim. Frederick, indeed, in his account of these proceedings, says not a word to this purpose; whence some writers have concluded that the affairs of Poland were not discussed at these interviews.[3] But this conclusion seems highly improbable. The partition of Poland must for some years have occupied the thoughts of Austrian and Prussian statesmen as an inevitable catastrophe. Such a conviction had at all events forced itself long before upon the minds of observant politicians. Already, in 1766, Von Essen, the Saxon Minister at Warsaw, had expressed in his despatches his opinion that the Court of St. Petersburg and the Kings of Prussia and Poland were agreed on a partition; and he further thought that Austria was also implicated in the scheme.[4] The steps taken by Austria and Prussia, in 1770,

[1] Hermann. B. v. S. 623.

[2] Frédéric II., *Œuvres*, t. vi. p. 29 (ed. 1847).

[3] See Ferrand, *Hist. des trois Démembremens*, t. i. p. 119.

[4] Essen's *Bericht vom 1 October*, 1766, ap. Hermann, *Gesch. Russlands*, B. v. S. 394 f. It may also be shown from Von Hammer's account of the events immediately preceding the war between

were almost universally regarded in political circles as the result of the conferences of the two monarchs.[1] About the middle of that year, Austrian troops took possession of the Starosties of Zips and Zandek, the *salines*, or salt works of Bochnia and Wieliczka, whence the King of Poland chiefly drew his revenues, and spread themselves even beyond Cracow. In November these districts were declared reunited with the Kingdom of Hungary; an Austrian government was established in them, the motto of whose official seal purported that they had been lawfully recovered.[2] In the autumn of the same year the King of Prussia, on pretence of forming a *cordon* against the plague, caused his troops to enter Polish Prussia and other districts. In the anarchy which reigned in Poland, and the devastation which ensued, commerce and agriculture were almost suspended; the peasants sought refuge in the towns, the nobles carried their property into neighbouring countries; and the want and famine which followed produced a pestilence. The Prussians, if they did not, like the Austrians, take formal possession of the districts they had invaded, acted at least as if they were the absolute masters of them, and even conducted themselves more arbitrarily than the Russians. Wood, forage, provisions of all sorts, were collected and forwarded into Brandenburg, which were paid for in a base and depreciated currency worth about one-third of its nominal value, and thousands of the inhabitants were carried off as recruits or colonists.[3]

In such a state of things it seems idle to inquire to whom the guilt attaches of first proposing a partition of Poland. The idea probably originated with the Empress Catharine, whose two great objects of ambition were, the subjection of Poland and the annihilation of Turkey. Since the time of Peter I. Poland had been virtually dependent on the will of Russia, and in the earlier part of her career Catharine was content with a vassal King of Poland; but in process of time she began to entertain the idea of making it a Russian province. Pozzo di Borgo explained to the Emperor Alexander, at Vienna, in 1814, that the

ussia and Turkey (B. viii.), that Austria as then acquainted with the views of ussia and Prussia respecting Poland, id in general agreed with them. See chlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrb.* B. iii. 212.

[1] Hermann, *ibid.* p. 484.

[2] "Sigillum administrationis terrarum cuperatarum."

[3] Von Raumer, *Polens Untergang*, erroneously denies this. From a certain number of acres Frederick required a young woman, a cow, a bed, and three ducats in money. Essen's *Despatch*, March 18th, 1771, ap. Hermann, B. v. S. 497. From these and other oppressions the Poles detested the Prussians even more cordially than they hated the Russians.

destruction of Poland was undertaken to bring Russia into more immediate connection with the rest of Europe; to obtain a lever wherewith to move Germany and other States.[1] The aims of Russia seem first to have been directed to obtain exclusive possession; but for this she was not strong enough; Austria and Prussia stepped in, and Austria was the first Power which actually occupied some of the Polish dominions. Russia, hampered with the Turkish war, was compelled to come to terms with her two rivals. The proposal for a partition seems to have been brought about as follows:—Prussia and Austria had offered their mediation between Russia and Turkey, which the Porte had at first rejected. But after the misfortunes in the North, and in the Bay of Chesmeh, it became more pliable. When Frederick, the Emperor, and Kaunitz were at Neustadt, in September, 1770, a note arrived from the Porte expressing its desire for peace, and begging the mediation of the Courts of Vienna and Berlin. Frederick undertook to acquaint the Czarina with this wish. His brother, Prince Henry, after a visit to his sister at Stockholm, arrived in St. Petersburg in October, with instructions to come to an understanding with Catharine, both on the Polish and Turkish questions. A scheme for a partition of Poland was first formally broached during this visit. Whether it came from Prince Henry or Catharine is unimportant.[2] Before the Prince quitted St. Petersburg, towards the end of January, 1771, the Czarina told him that she was prepared to come to an agreement with his brother on the subject. She had overruled the objections of her minister Panin, who opposed the partition, not because it violated international rights, but because he wished not that others should share with Russia what he thought she might obtain alone.

[1] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, vol. ii. p. 347 (Eng. Transl.).

[2] The majority of writers incline to believe that Frederick was the first proposer of the scheme. He himself, indeed, denies it, but probability seems to lie so much the other way that one almost feels inclined to believe, with a French historian, that the denial was made "pour tromper la postérité" (Martin, t. xvi. p. 299, note). As early as 1733, when Frederick was still Crown Prince, he recommended his father to invade Polish Prussia, and thus unite the Kingdom of Prussia with Brandenburg (*ibid.* p. 258); and as soon as the Turkish war broke out, he insinuated to Catharine that in order to deter Austria from opposing the progress of the Russian arms in Turkey, an understanding should be come to respecting the division of some of the Polish provinces between Austria, Russia, and Prussia (*Œuvres*, t. vi. p. 27, Berlin, ed. 1846). Nor is it likely that the proposal of a partition should have first come from the Court of St. Petersburg, which was desirous of obtaining the *whole* of Poland. On this subject, see Coxe, *House of Austria*, and Rulhière, *Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne*.

On the other side of the question see Dohm, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, B. i. Beilage A., and an elaborate note in Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xiv. p. 24 sqq., with the authorities there cited. The whole affair is a labyrinth of dirty intrigue, in which each party was endeavouring to circumvent the other.

Frederick was, or pretended to be, astonished at the overture; but finding that Catharine was in earnest, he undertook to obtain the consent and co-operation of Austria. Kaunitz at first alleged that he feared to propose the scheme to his mistress, Maria Theresa, who either felt or affected aversion to the project; he also apprehended that it might induce Louis XV. to break the alliance with Austria, which he regarded as the *chef-d'œuvre* of his policy. But after a little display of that diplomacy for which he was so famous, he came to a complete agreement with the Court of St. Petersburg, and succeeded in procuring Maria Theresa's consent to the scheme, on the ground that it would avoid an effusion of blood. Kaunitz now displayed the greatest zeal and disinterestedness in the cause of Catharine, and even offered to back an ultimatum which she had proposed to the Sultan. Yet at this very time he concluded with the Porte a secret treaty against Russia (July 6th, 1771);[1] not, however, with any real purpose of aiding either the Porte or the Polish Republic; but that he might be able, according to circumstances, to thwart the plans of Russia, and render more secure the participation of Austria in the spoils of Poland. He even assured Prince Galitzin that he was prepared to assist the policy of Russia and Prussia in Poland. And though he pretended that he would not hear of a partition, yet, by refusing to abandon Austria's pretensions to the County of Zips, he virtually challenged those two Powers to make proposals for such a measure.[2]

However secret was this treaty, it came to the knowledge of Catharine, and its effect was, though from motives of policy she dissembled her acquaintance with it, to hasten the settlement of Poland. An attempt of the Confederate Poles, in November, 1771, to carry off King Stanislaus Augustus, operated in the same direction. Catharine drew from this event a fresh pretext for hostility against the Republic, and the King of Poland was more than ever inclined to throw himself into the arms of Russia. The chief difficulties in the negotiations between the Courts of St. Petersburg and Berlin regarded the towns of Thorn and Dantzic, and Catharine's demand that Frederick should assist her with all his forces in case she became involved in a war with Austria. To this Frederick at last consented, on the condition that, in her peace with the Porte, Russia should relinquish her

[1] Wenck, t. iii. p. 820.
[2] Galitzin's *Letter* to Panin, in Görtz, *Mémoires et Actes Authentiques*, p. 75.

conquests of Moldavia and Wallachia, and thus obviate all cause of quarrel with Austria. In return for this concession Frederick desisted from claiming Thorn and Dantzic, certain that, when once master of the mouth of the Vistula, he should sooner or later obtain those important places. The Convention of St. Petersburg, of February 17th, 1772, between Russia and Prussia, is known only by what Frederick tells us of it.[1] The limits of the partition were determined, the period for taking possession fixed for June, and the Empress-Queen was to be invited to partake the spoil. Russia and Prussia reciprocally guaranteed their possessions, and agreed to assist each other against Austria in case of need.

The Court of Vienna, stimulated by the restless ambition of Joseph II., made the most extravagant demands. Maria Theresa afterwards told Baron Breteuil, the French Ambassador at Vienna, that she had done so in order to break off the whole matter, but to her surprise her claims were granted by Frederick and Catharine.[2] The sincerity of this declaration is somewhat suspicious; at all events, these exaggerated demands were long obstinately insisted on; but this was probably owing to Joseph II. and Kaunitz, who appeared to have overruled the more moderate counsels of the Empress-Queen. An armistice had been concluded between Russia and Turkey, May 30th, 1772, and early in August a Congress was opened at Fokchany to treat for a peace, so that the three Powers were at liberty to prosecute their designs on Poland. The Confederates of Bar had hitherto been able to make some resistance, as the Russian troops in Poland, under the command of Suvaroff, did not exceed 10,000 or 12,000 men; but after the armistice they were increased to 30,000. Pulawski, the principal leader of the Confederation, when he heard of the union of the three Powers, retired from a hopeless contest, and exhorted his followers to reserve themselves for better times. After some further negotiations between the three Sovereigns, a triple treaty, assigning to each his respective share of Poland, was signed at St. Petersburg, August 5th, 1772; namely, between Austria and Russia, Russia and Prussia, and Austria and Prussia. Of these the first two only have been published, and are of the same tenour.[3]

[1] *Œuvres Posth.* t. vi. p. 42.

[2] Flassan, *Diplomatie Française*, t. vii. p. 125 sq.

[3] A summary of them will be found in Koch and Schöll, *Hist. des Traités de Paix*, t. xiv. p. 42 sqq. Maria Theresa gave her consent in these words: "*Placet*, because so many great and learned men will it; but when I am dead, the consequences will appear of this violation of all that has been hitherto held just and sacred." Mailath, *Gesch. Oestreichs*, B. v. S. 109. Lodomeria, assigned to Austria, is Wladimir, in Volhynia.

Russia obtained by this act Polish Livonia, the greater part of the Palatinates of Witepsk and Polozk, all the Palatinate of Mstislavl, and the two extremities of that of Minsk. These districts afterwards formed the governments of Polozk and Mohilev. They comprised an area of 2,500 geographical square miles, and a population of about one and a half million souls.

To Austria were assigned the thirteen towns of the County of Zips, which King Sigismund of Hungary had hypothecated to Poland in 1412; about half the Palatinate of Cracovia, a part of that of Sandomierz, the Palatinate of Red Russia, the greater part of that of Belz, Procutia, and a very small portion of Podolia. The towns of the County of Zips were again incorporated with Hungary; the other districts were erected into a separate State, with the title of Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria. They were estimated at 1,300 square miles, with a population of about two and a half millions.

Prussia obtained all Pomerelia except Dantzic and its territory, together with Great Poland beyond the Netze, extending from the New March to Fordon and Schulitz on the Vistula. Also the rest of Polish Prussia, the Palatinate of Marienburg, Elbing, the Bishopric of Warmia, and the Palatinate of Culm, except Thorn, which, like Dantzic, was to remain to the Republic of Poland. These provinces embraced 700 square miles, and had a population of about 800,000 souls. Although the Prussian share was smaller than the others, yet it was very valuable to Frederick, because it joined his Prussian Kingdom to the main body of the monarchy. The population, too, was richer and more commercial. The districts thus confiscated formed about a third part of Poland.

In September, the three Powers published Declarations proclaiming and justifying the steps which they had taken. The most odious of these Declarations was the Prussian. Frederick II. went back to the thirteenth century to find a colour for part of his usurpations, and claimed the remainder by way of compensation for rights so long withheld from his house. Maria Theresa, more prudently and more honestly, passed lightly over the question of right, and pleaded her engagements with her allies. Catharine II. chiefly insisted on the distracted state of Poland, the necessity of restoring peace, and of establishing a natural and more secure boundary between the possessions of the two States.[1] Simultaneously with these Declarations, the combined

[1] The Declarations are in Martens, *Recueil*, t. i. p. 461 sqq.

Powers proceeded to occupy the districts respectively allotted to them. In this they found but little difficulty. The Confederates had been driven from their last strongholds in the spring; and the generals of the allies had declared that they should treat those who combined together, under whatever pretence, as bandits and murderers.[1]

The memoirs of the three Courts were answered by the Polish Government in a counter-declaration, full of truth and force, in which they recalled the treaties which had guaranteed to the Republic the integrity of its possessions; and they justly observed that if titles drawn from remote antiquity, when revolutions were so common and so transient, were to be enforced against Poland, provinces possessed by those very Powers which now urged such titles against her, might also be reunited to that Kingdom; but the admission of them, they remarked, would shake the foundations of all the thrones in the world.[2]

The unfortunate King of Poland, abandoned by all the world, was compelled by the allied Courts to convoke a Diet in order to confirm their usurpations by a Treaty of Cession, and to establish regulations for the pacification and future government of the country. At the same time each Power caused 10,000 men to enter the provinces which they had agreed to leave to Poland; and the three commanders of them were ordered to proceed to Warsaw and to act in concert, and with severity, towards those nobles who should cabal against the novelties introduced.[3] The Diet, which was opened April 19th, 1773, was very small, consisting only of 111 Nuncios. Those nobles whose possessions lay in the confiscated provinces were excluded from it. Nearly all the members accepted bribes. A sum of 200 or 300 ducats was the price of silence; they who took an active part in favour of the allies received more. The national character had, indeed, sunk to the lowest point of degradation. The ruin of Poland was consummated by its own children amidst every kind of luxury, frivolity, and profligacy;[4]—balls, dinners, assemblies, and gaming tables. To avoid the *Veto*, the Diet was converted into a Confederation, which the King was forced to recognize by the threat that Russia, Austria, and Prussia would otherwise each send 50,000 men into Poland. After long and turbulent debates, treaties were signed with the three Powers, September 18th,

[1] Ferrand, t. ii. liv. v.
[2] Martens, *Recueil*, t. i. p. 470.
[3] *Œuvres de Fréd. II.* t. vi. p. 58 (ed. 1847).
[4] Essen's *Bericht*, ap. Hermann, B. v. S. 541.

1773. The whole business, however, was not concluded till March, 1775, by the execution on the part of the Polish King and Republic of seven separate acts or treaties, namely, three with Russia, two with Austria, and two with Prussia.[1] These acts included the cession of the confiscated provinces. A new Constitution was established for Poland, which Russia guaranteed. The Crown was to be perpetually elective, and none but a Piast noble having possessions in the Kingdom was to be eligible. The son or grandson of a deceased King could not be elected till after an interval of two reigns. The Government was to be composed of the King and two estates, the Senate, and the Equestrian Order. A permanent Executive Council was to be established, composed of an equal number of members of the two estates, without, however, either legislative or judicial power. Thus the seal was put to the vicious Constitution of Poland; the King was reduced to a mere puppet, and the ground prepared for the final extinction of the Kingdom.

The first partition of Poland is the most remarkable event of the eighteenth century, before the French Revolution. Breaches of national rights as gross as this have undoubtedly been perpetrated both before and since; but what rendered it particularly odious, and most revolted public opinion in Europe, was the circumstance that three great and powerful Sovereigns should combine together to commit such an act of spoliation. The Cabinets of Europe, however, were either silent or confined themselves to feeble remonstrances. The political effects of the partition were not, indeed, so important as it has been sometimes supposed. Poland itself was of but little weight in the political balance of Europe, and the three great Powers which divided the spoils, by receiving pretty equal shares, remained much in the same position with respect to one another as they had occupied before. Great Britain, engaged in paying court to Catharine II., in order to separate her from the Prussian alliance, took no steps to prevent the partition, and contented itself, in the interests of its commerce, with inciting Catharine not to let Dantzic and Thorn fall into Frederick's hands. With regard to France, the Duc d'Aiguillon, who had succeeded Choiseul in the Ministry, either through his own fault or that of the Cardinal de Rohan, the French Ambassador at Vienna, seems not to have been acquainted with the partition till informed of it at Paris by the Imperial

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. iv. p. 142 sqq.

Ambassador.[1] To amend the fault of his improvidence, he tried to persuade Louis XV. to attack the Austrian Netherlands; but this proposition was rejected by the majority of the Council, on account of the state of the finances. It was also proposed to England to send a French and English fleet into the Baltic, to prevent the consummation of the dismemberment, but the proposal was coldly received.[2]

We now resume the history of the Russian and Turkish war, interrupted in order to bring to a conclusion the affairs of Poland. The Porte, as we have said, had in 1770 accepted the mediation of Austria and Prussia. But Russia rejected the interference of any Power, and put her terms so high, by insisting on occupying Moldavia and Wallachia for a term of twenty-five years, which, of course, meant permanently, that it was impossible to listen to them. Kaunitz, therefore, entered into the treaty with the Porte of July 6th, 1771, already mentioned, by which Austria was to receive 20,000 purses (10,000,000 piastres, or 11,250,000 gulden), on the score of her warlike preparations, and was also to obtain a portion of Wallachia; while she engaged to assist the Porte in recovering all the conquests of the Russians, and to compel them to evacuate Poland. Kaunitz's secret object in this treaty we have already seen. Russia showed herself so compliant, that the Austrian Minister did not think it necessary to ratify the treaty, although he received a good part of the subsidy.

The campaign of 1771 was unimportant on the Danube; but the Russians, under Dolgorouki, subdued the Crimea, as well as Arabat, Yenikale, Kertsch, Kaffa, and Taman. The Tartars now submitted to Russia, on condition of retaining their ancient customs, and Catharine appointed a new Khan. We have already mentioned the truce of 1772, and the Congress of Fokchany; which, however, like a subsequent one at Bucharest, proved fruitless. The war, when renewed in 1773, went in favour of the Turks. The Russians were compelled to recross the Danube and remain on the defensive.

Sultan Mustapha died towards the end of this year (December 24th). His death had little influence on the course of events. His weak brother and successor, Abdul Hamed, then forty-eight years of age, was in the hands of the war party. The ensuing campaign was opened with great pomp by the Turks in April, 1774, but they were soon so thoroughly beaten as to be glad of a

[1] Ségur, *Politique de tous les Cabinets*, t. i. p. 183.

[2] Flassan, *Diplomatie Franç.*, t. vii. p. 87; Coxe, *House of Austria*, vol. v.

peace on almost any terms. Never was a celebrated treaty concluded in so short a space of time as that dictated in four hours by Count Romanzoff, in his camp at Kutchuk Kainardji (July 16th), where the Turks were almost entirely surrounded. By this peace the Tartars of the Crimea, Kuban, &c., were declared independent of either empire, and were to enjoy the right of electing their Khan from the family of Zingis; only they were to recognize the Sultan as Caliph and head of their religion. Russia restored to the Tartars her conquests in the Crimea, &c., retaining only Kertsch and Yenikale. She also restored to the Porte Bessarabia, Moldavia, Wallachia, &c., and the islands in the Archipelago; retaining Kinburn and its territory, Azof, the two Kabardas, but evacuating Georgia and Mingrelia. The Turks, however, abandoned the tribute of young men and women, which they had been accustomed to exact from these countries; and they agreed to pay four million roubles for the costs of the war. Poland, which had caused the breach between the two Empires, was not even named in the treaty.[1] A year after this peace, the Porte ceded to Austria the Bukovina, or Red Forest, a district formerly belonging to Transylvania, which connected that country with the newly-acquired Kingdom of Galicia.

During the course of this war (1773), Catharine II. was alarmed by the rebellion of a Cossack deserter named Pugatscheff, who personated the character of Peter III., to which Prince he bore some resemblance. Many thousand discontented Cossacks flocked to his standard, and at one time it was apprehended that Moscow itself would rise in his favour. But the peace put an end to his hopes, and he was shortly afterwards captured and put to death.[2]

[1] The treaty will be found in Wilkinson's *Account of Moldavia and Wallachia.*

[2] Peter III. had also been personated in Dalmatia by a Montenegrin adventurer named Stefano. An insurrection which he excited in 1767 was quelled in the following year.

CHAPTER L.

THE Emperor was celebrating at Innsbruck the marriage of his second son, Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, with Maria Louisa, Infanta of Spain, when, on entering his son's apartment, on the evening of August 18th, 1765, he sank into his arms in a fit of apoplexy, and immediately expired. By this event, his eldest son Joseph, who had been elected King of the Romans, and crowned at Frankfort[1] in the spring of 1764, became Emperor, with the title of Joseph II. Francis I. was fifty-eight years of age at the time of his death. He was a good-humoured, polite gentleman, and had enriched himself by entering into various commercial and banking speculations. He had so little ambition, that he was better pleased to appear as a private man than as an Emperor, and although co-Regent with his wife, took little or no part in the government of the Austrian Monarchy. The Austrian Government, therefore, proceeded in much the same train as before. Maria Theresa, who had experienced in her early days the evils and horrors of war, was inclined to pursue a peaceful policy. It was her aim to strengthen the connection with the Bourbon Courts, with which view she gave the hand of her daughter, Maria Antoinette,[2] to the Dauphin, afterwards Louis XVI., May 19th, 1770. Another Archduchess married Ferdinand IV., King of the Two Sicilies, and a third was united with the Duke of Parma.

But the character of Joseph II. differed from his mother's. Although possessed of considerable talents, he was tormented with a febrile and restless ambition, without any very fixed or definite object. During his father's lifetime he had endeavoured to procure the reversion to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, to the prejudice of his brother Leopold; alleging, that although he should become an Emperor on his father's death, he should not possess a foot of territory. Maria Theresa, to satisfy this craving, had promised to make him co-Regent of Austria on the death of her hus-

[1] Goethe, then a youth of fifteen, was present at the ceremony, and has left a description of it in his *Wahrheit und Dichtung*, Buch. v.

[2] Born November 2nd, 1755.

band; but, during his mother's lifetime, that office remained little more than nominal. It was chiefly through Joseph's ambition and desire of aggrandizement that Austria was threatened with the War of the Bavarian Succession. This affair, which assumes very small dimensions when compared with the wars of the Spanish and Austrian Successions, need not occupy any great share of our attention.

By the death of Maximilian Joseph, Elector of Bavaria, December 30th, 1777, the younger branch of the House of Wittelsbach became extinct, and with it the Bavarian Electorate, which had been vested only in that family. Charles Theodore, Elector Palatine, as representative of the elder, or Rodolphine, branch of the House of Wittelsbach, was undoubtedly entitled to succeed to the Bavarian dominions, with the exception of the allodial possessions. The common ancestor of the two branches, Louis the Severe, Elector Palatine and Duke of Bavaria, had divided the succession to those possessions between his two sons, Rodolph and Louis, in 1310; and the latter, after obtaining the Imperial Crown as Louis V., had confirmed this partition by a treaty with his nephews, sons of his elder brother, Rodolph, in 1329. By this treaty the two contracting parties had reserved the right of reciprocal succession in their respective dominions, the Rhenish Electoral Palatinate and the Duchy of Bavaria.[1] Several claimants, however, burrowing in the inexhaustible chaos of the German archives, advanced pretensions to various parts of the Bavarian dominions. Maria Theresa, as Queen of Bohemia, claimed the fiefs of Upper Bavaria, and, as Archduchess of Austria, all the districts which had belonged to the line of Straubingen. But of this line she was not the true representative, but rather Frederick II. of Prussia, as descended from the eldest sister. Nor were her pretensions as Queen of Bohemia better founded.[2] Joseph II. also claimed several portions of Bavaria as Imperial fiefs. But his pretensions were contrary to the provisions of the Golden Bull, as well as the Peace of Westphalia and the public law of Germany, which recognizes as valid such family compacts as those made by the House of Wittelsbach, even though detrimental to the rights of the Empire.[3] Other minor claimants were the Electress Dowager of Saxony, who, as sister of Maximilian Joseph, claimed the allodial succession; and the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, who claimed the Landgraviate of Leuchtenberg by virtue of an

[1] Pfeffel, t. i. pp. 472, 494.

[2] See Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. iv. p. 246.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 248.

expectative granted by the Emperor Maximilian I. to one of his ancestors.

Charles Theodore, having no heirs, agreed to the claims of the House of Austria, which comprised half Bavaria, in the hope of thereby procuring protection and provision for his numerous illegitimate children; and the Court of Vienna had indulged the hope that the King of Prussia, now bent down by age and infirmities, would not endanger the glories of his youth by forcibly opposing the arrangement. The Convention, however, appeared to Frederick not only to menace the constitution of the German Empire, but, by giving to Austria so large an accession of territory, even to imperil the safety of his own Kingdom. Such being his views, he formed an alliance with the Duke of Deux-Ponts, nephew of Charles Theodore, and next heir to the Bavarian Duchy, whose inheritance had been thus mutilated without his consent; and he undertook to defend the Duke's rights against the House of Austria. Joseph II. would listen to no terms of accommodation; war became inevitable, and, in 1778, large armies were brought into the field by both sides, which, however, did nothing but observe each other. Austria claimed the aid of France by virtue of the treaty between the two countries. Louis XVI., who then occupied the throne of France, pressed by his Austrian consort, Maria Antoinette, remained for some time undecided. But France, then engaged in a war with England, on the subject of the revolted North American colonies,[1] wished not to be hampered with a European war, and Louis at length declared his intention to remain neutral. Yet, to appease his brother-in-law, the Emperor, who reproached him with his desertion, Louis was weak enough secretly to furnish the fifteen million livres stipulated by the treaty.[2] Maria Theresa endeavoured to avert an effusion of blood. Without consulting her son, or her minister, Prince Kaunitz, she despatched Baron Thugut to Frederick with an autograph letter containing fresh offers of peace, and painted to him her despair at the prospect of their tearing out each other's grey hairs.[3] But the negotiations were again broken off by the anger and impatience of Joseph. The Emperor threatened, when he heard of them, to establish his residence at Aix-la-Chapelle, or some other Imperial town, and never again to return to Vienna.

The campaign of 1779 was almost as barren of events as that of

[1] See next chapter.

[2] Soulavie, *Mém. du Règne de Louis XVI.* t. v. p. 53.

[3] Coxe, *House of Austria*, ch. cxxix. Maria Theresa's letter to Mercy, 31st July, 1778 (D'Arneth, *Correspondence Secrète, &c.* iii. 229).

the preceding year. The only notable event of the war was the surprise and capture of a Prussian corps of 1,200 men at Habelschwerdt by the Austrian general, Wurmser, January 18th. Under the mediation of France and Russia, negotiations for a peace were opened at Teschen, in Austrian Silesia, March 14th, and a treaty was signed, May 13th, the anniversary of Maria Theresa's birth. The principal points were that the Court of Vienna withdrew its opposition to the reunion of Anspach and Baireuth with the Electorate of Brandenburg on the extinction of the reigning line, by abandoning, on that event, the feudal claim of the Crown of Bohemia to those margraviates. Charles Theodore ceded to Austria what is called the quarter of the Inn, or the district extending from Passau along the Inn and Salza to Wildshut; comprising about one-sixteenth part of Bavaria. The claims of Saxony were satisfied with six million florins.[1] Thus was established a new House of Bavaria, more powerful than the former one, since it reunited Bavaria with the Palatinate. Russia guaranteed the Peace of Teschen; and as this treaty renewed the Peace of Westphalia, it afforded that Power a pretext to meddle in the affairs of Germany. We will here anticipate the sequel of this affair. An attempt of Joseph II. in 1784 to appropriate Bavaria by exchanging for it the Austrian Netherlands, together with some acts of the Imperial Court, deemed contrary to the German Constitution, occasioned the Fursten Bund, or League of the German Princes, formed in 1785, under the auspices of Frederick the Great, to uphold the Peace of Teschen.[2] With regard to Europe the most significant part of this league was the reconciliation of Prussia with England, through George III. as Elector of Hanover, a change soon to bear its fruits: with regard to Germany, it marks the beginning of *dualism*, or Austrian and Prussian rivalry.

Maria Theresa did not long survive the war of the Bavarian succession. She expired November 29th, 1780, in the sixty-fourth year of her age, after reigning forty years. Exemplary in her private life, and sincerely desirous of the welfare of her people, there are few serious blemishes in the life of this excellent sovereign, except, perhaps, her intolerance. At the commence-

[1] Hertzberg, *Recueil*, t. ii. p. 267; Martens, t. ii. p. i.

[2] Dohm, *Denwürdigkeiten meiner Zeit*, Band iii. Kap. xvi.; J. von Müller, *Darstellung des Fürstenbunds*, in the 9th vol. of his Works; Ranke, *Die Deutschen Mächte und der Fürstenbund*; Hertzberg, *Recueil*, t. ii. p. 292; Martens, t. ii. p. 553. The members of the League were Frederick, as Elector of Brandenburg, the Electors of Hanover, Saxony, and Mentz, the Dukes of Saxe-Weimar, Saxe-Gotha, Deux-Ponts, Mecklenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Bishop of Osnaburg, the Prince of Anhalt, the Margrave of Baden.

ment of her reign, she formed the design of banishing the Jews from her dominions; from which she was dissuaded by the Elector of Mentz, the Kings of England and Poland, and the Pope.[1] She even lent herself in some degree to oppress the Protestants. Yet she was far from being the slave of the Pope. Having resumed with his consent the title of "Apostolical," conferred by Sylvester II. on St. Stephen, first King of Hungary, she exercised under that almost forgotten appellation an extensive and independent jurisdiction in the Hungarian Church. Of her abolition of the Jesuits we shall speak in the next chapter, when we shall have to relate the fall of that Society.

The Emperor Joseph II. was forty years of age when he succeeded to the Austrian dominions. He possessed, as we have said, no despicable talents; but he had been badly educated, had little taste for literature or art, though, like his model, Frederick II., he had imbibed some of the French liberalism of the period, and as he was naturally impetuous, his ill-regulated ambition plunged him into misfortunes. First, as we have seen, he coveted Bavaria; then he turned his views towards Turkey; next he embroiled himself with Holland; and, finally with the Netherlands and his own hereditary States.

Joseph's meddling activity was first displayed, to the great relief of Frederick II., in domestic reforms, especially in the Church. By a decree of October 30th, 1781, such monastic orders were first dissolved as were of no practical use in the State, by keeping school, tending the sick, preaching, confessing, and the like; as the Carthusians, Camaldolenses, Hermits, and in general all female orders which did not employ themselves in education, nursing, &c. Other orders were then attacked, and in all about 700 convents were dissolved. Frederick maliciously remarked that the richer convents were suppressed in preference to the poorer, though the public good required a contrary proceeding. Thus, about 36,000 monks and nuns were secularized and pensioned. It was forbidden to send money to Rome or to receive dispensations thence, except *gratis;* and the investiture of all spiritual prebends in Lombardy was appropriated by the Emperor. An edict of toleration was published, by which the religious privileges of Protestants and non-united Greek Christians were considerably extended. The Papal nuncios were told that they would be

[1] Raumer, *Beiträge zur N. Gesch.* Th. ii. Abs. 20. Frederick II. had formed a high opinion of Maria Theresa: "She has done honour to the throne and to her sex," he writes to D'Alembert, in January, 1781. "I have made war upon her, but I have never been her enemy."—*Œuvres*, t. xi. p. 292.

regarded only as political ambassadors by the Austrian Ministers at the various Courts where they resided.[1] Prince Kaunitz, an *esprit fort* of the French school, was, doubtless, in a great degree, the author of this policy, which was adopted by Joseph II. partly because he did not wish to appear behind the other enlightened princes of the age, and partly to increase the wealth and population of his States by attracting to them Protestant traders and artizans.

Pope Pius VI., who had succeeded Clement XIV. in the Papal Chair in 1775, was so alarmed by these vigorous reforms that he resolved on visiting Vienna, in the hope of encouraging by his presence the dejected Catholics, as well as of overawing the Emperor by his dignity and captivating him by the charm of his manner. He made his entry into Vienna in great state in March, 1782, accompanied by Joseph and his brother, who had gone out to meet him. His appearance caused great excitement. Vast crowds thronged to the Burg to obtain a sight, and receive the blessing of the Holy Father; and he was obliged to show himself on the balcony several times every day. He celebrated the festival of Easter in St. Stephen's Church; but the absence of the Emperor was remarked; who was unwilling, it was said, to gratify the pontiff's vanity by occupying a lower throne than that erected for the successor of St. Peter. Pius succeeded in filling the people with enthusiasm, but made no impression on the Emperor, and thus derived no advantage from a visit by which he seemed to degrade his dignity and abdicate his infallibility. Joseph overwhelmed him with honour, but would enter into no negotiations; while from Prince Kaunitz, whom he tried to conciliate, he experienced nothing but rudeness and repulse.[2] The Emperor accompanied the Pope on his return as far as Mariabrunn. Here they prayed together in the convent church, and seemed to part with emotion; but on the very same day Imperial commissaries appeared in the convent, and pronounced it dissolved. After the Pope's return to Rome an angry correspondence ensued between him and the Emperor. Joseph returned the visit of Pius by appearing unexpectedly at Rome in December, 1783, under the title of Count Falkenstein. He was now meditating a complete

[1] Menzel, B. vi. Kap. xi.

[2] Kaunitz not having paid him a visit, Pius was humble enough to ask to see his palace and its curiosities. The Prince received him in a morning dress, shook the hand he held out to him to kiss like that of an old acquaintance, put on his hat with the excuse that his head could not bear the cold, and dragged the Pope about by the arm, on the pretence of putting him in a proper light to see the pictures. Bourgoing, *Mém. Historique sur Pie VI.* ap. Menzel.

breach with the Papal See, from which, however, he was dissuaded by the Chevalier Azara, the Spanish Resident at Rome. He made an advantageous treaty with the Pope regarding the Lombard Church; but from this time forward he treated the Holy Father less roughly.[1]

Joseph's measures were highly unpopular in Hungary. The idea of the independent nationality of the Hungarians was disagreeable to him, and he disappointed their hopes that he would celebrate his coronation and hold a Diet among them. The Holy Crown of St. Stephen, an object venerated by the Magyars during eight centuries, was carried to Vienna, and deposited in the treasure-chamber; Hungary was divided into ten circles, all public business was transacted in the German tongue,[2] and the ancient Hungarian Constitution was annihilated. Joseph was of opinion that all his subjects should speak the same language, and, as his German possessions were the most important, that the German tongue should have the preference. The nobles protested, but obeyed, while an insurrection of the peasants was speedily quelled.

The Emperor was as hasty in his foreign policy as in his domestic, and hence it had seldom a happy issue. He succeeded, however, in overthrowing the Barrier Treaty, which had always been disagreeable to the House of Austria. Joseph made a journey into the Netherlands and Holland in 1781. His attention was chiefly attracted in this tour by two things—the disastrous effects arising from the closing of the Scheldt, and the blind bigotry of the Brabanters, which kept them behind other nations; and he resolved if possible to remedy these evils. During the Seven Years' War the Dutch had withdrawn their garrisons from the Austrian Netherlands, in order to prevent their coming in contact with the French or English, but sent them back after peace had been concluded. Maria Theresa had overlooked this conduct; but towards the end of 1781, Joseph gave notice to the States-General to withdraw their troops from the barrier towns. In vain the States remonstrated: Kaunitz only replied, "The Emperor will hear no more about barriers; they no longer exist." He confided in the French alliance; and as the Dutch, besides being harassed by intestine discord, were then involved in a war with England, to which we shall advert in the following chapter, they had no re-

[1] Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. Kap. xi.

[2] An unforeseen consequence of this arbitrary introduction of the German language was to awaken the expiring Magyar tongue to a new life. Mailath, *Gesch. des östr. Kaiserstaates*, B. v. S. 150.

source but to protest and comply. The barrier fortresses were then razed—a step which Austria had afterwards cause to rue.

The Emperor soon afterwards demanded from the Dutch the free navigation of the Scheldt; and this demand was accompanied with others respecting boundaries.[1] The States-General, in reply, appealed to the fourteenth article of the Treaty of Münster, ordering the closing of the Scheldt, and the fifth article of the Treaty of Vienna in 1731, abolishing the Ostend Company, and proscribing all commerce between the Austrian Netherlands and the Indies. They placed a Dutch squadron at the mouth of the Scheldt, renewed their treaty of alliance and subsidies with the Elector of Cologne, who was Joseph's brother, October 30th, 1784,[2] and also endeavoured to renew their alliance with England, broken since the American war, to which we shall advert in a subsequent chapter. The English Cabinet determined to remain neutral, but the fear of such an alliance induced the French to support Holland. France continued to regard Austria, in spite of the alliance between the two countries, as a probable rival, and had always opposed the wish of Maria Theresa to be admitted into the Family Compact.[3] Catharine II., on the other hand, supported the demands of the Emperor. To bring the question to an issue, Joseph ordered some Austrian ships to ascend the Scheldt, in attempting which they were fired upon by the Dutch. The Emperor now put an army of 30,000 men in motion; the Dutch opened their sluices, and everything seemed to threaten the outbreak of a war. But Louis XVI. declared to the Court of Vienna, that he should oppose any hostile attempt upon Holland; and causing two armies to assemble, one in Flanders, and the other on the Rhine, he offered his mediation. This led to a settlement. The Emperor relinquished his demands for a sum of nine and a half million guilders. The Dutch would pay only five million; but Louis engaged to make good the difference—a step which bred much ill blood among the French, who imputed it to Maria Antoinette's love for her brother Joseph. The Emperor had likewise demanded an apology for the insult to his flag; but he interrupted the Dutch deputies as soon as they began it. The definitive treaty, guaranteed by France, was signed at FONTAINEBLEAU, November 8th, 1785.[4] The Treaty of Münster was taken as its basis, and the Barrier

[1] See *Tableau sommaire des Prétentions de l'Empereur*, presented at the Conferences in Brussels in May, 1784, in Martens, *Erzählung merkw. Fälle des neuern Eur. Volkerrechts*, ii. 50 f.

[2] Martens, t. ii. p. 540.

[3] *Politique de tous les Cabinets*, ap. Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 311.

[4] Martens, t. ii. p. 602.

Treaty, and that of Vienna of 1731, were annulled. The Dutch having attained their main object in shutting up the Scheldt, made more cessions of forts, &c., even than the Emperor had demanded.

The Dutch followed up this treaty with another of alliance with France, November 10th, 1785.[1] Holland, as we have hinted, was at this time the scene of domestic disturbances, and one of the objects of the French alliance was to procure for the Republican party the support of France against the House of Orange. The dissensions of the two factions had been nourished by the long minority of the hereditary Stadholder William V. At the death of his father, in 1751, that Prince was only three years of age. Until 1759, the regency was conducted by his mother, an English Princess; and, after her death, the guardianship of the young Stadholder was divided between the States-General and Louis Ernest of Brunswick, Field-Marshal of the Republic. When, in 1766, William V. attained his majority, he signed an act called the *Act of Consultation*, engaging the Duke of Brunswick to assist him in his affairs—a proceeding regarded as unconstitutional by the patriotic or Republican party. The provinces of West Friesland, Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht, where that party chiefly prevailed, demanded the Duke's dismissal; who, fatigued by the clamours of the people, at length resigned, in October, 1784, abandoning the Stadholder, who had little political capacity, to the intrigues of his enemies. During this long and stormy period the patriot party had courted the protection of France, while those who were attached to the family of Orange, and desired to uphold the Stadholderate, cultivated the friendship of England. The chief leaders of the aristocratical or patriot party were Van Berkel, Pensionary of Amsterdam, to whom Van Bleiswyk, Grand Pensionary of Holland, though far superior in rank, was entirely subservient; Gyzlaas, Pensionary of Dordrecht, and Zeebergen, Pensionary of Haarlem. The superior influence of the patriot party dragged the United Provinces into the maritime war against England, which, for the present, we pass over, as we shall have to relate it in the ensuing chapter. We have already recorded the struggle of the Dutch with the Emperor Joseph II. Their accommodation with that Sovereign was hastened by their domestic dissensions. A tumult had broken out at the Hague in September, 1785. The States-General deprived William of the command of the garrison in that town, who thereupon

[1] Martens, t. ii. p. 612.

claimed the protection of his uncle-in-law, the King of Prussia. Frederick II. did not show much zeal in the cause of his relative,[1] but he took some steps in his favour, and the apprehension of Prussian interference caused the States-General to conclude the arrangement with the Emperor, and the subsequent alliance with France, already recorded.

The Republican party, encouraged by this alliance, proceeded to lengths which ultimately produced a revolution. William V., at the request of the States of Gelderland, who were devoted to his cause, had taken military possession of two towns in that province, which, in contempt of his prerogative, had ventured to name their own magistrates. Hereupon the States of Holland, arrogating to themselves a right to judge the proceedings of a neighbouring province, suspended the Prince from his office of captain-general (September, 1786). These events were followed by great excitement and irritation; which France endeavoured to allay by sending M. Rayneval to the Hague, to act in concert with the Prussian Minister, Baron Görtz.

A new Sovereign now occupied the throne of Prussia. Frederick II. died August 17th, 1786, after a reign of forty-six years. If the title of GREAT may be justly bestowed on the Sovereign, who, by his abilities and conduct, adds largely to his possessions, without inquiring very strictly into the means by which these acquisitions were made, Frederick is undoubtedly entitled to the appellation. Silesia, conquered by his arms, the Polish provinces, acquired by his diplomacy, formed an immense and highly valuable addition to the Prussian Monarchy, and may entitle him to be regarded as its second founder. The increase of his means and power is thus stated by a contemporary diplomatist: "He found, on his father's death, a revenue of 13,000,000 crowns; a treasure of 16,000,000; no debts, and an army of 50,000 men; and, at the time, this was reckoned the greatest effort of economy. He has now an income of 21,000,000 crowns; three times that sum, at least, in his coffers; and nearly 200,000 effective men."[2] Frederick had employed the years of peace which followed the Seven Years' War in alleviating, by a paternal administration, the evils which that struggle had brought upon his country. This period, though not the most brilliant, was the happiest of his reign. Manufactures and agriculture flourished; the towns and villages

[1] See Frederick's Letters in Hertzberg, *Recueil de Déductions*, t. ii. p. 394 sqq.

[2] *Despatch* of Sir James Harris (afterwards Earl of Malmesbury) to the Earl of Suffolk, March 18th, 1766, in Adolphus, *Hist. of George III.* vol. ii. App. No. ii. The same letter contains a discriminating character of Frederick.

ruined during the war were rebuilt and repeopled; the army was again raised to a formidable footing, and the finances were re-established by the introduction of the strictest order and economy into all branches of the administration. Frederick's measures with regard to commerce, though well meant, were not so happy. In political economy he was an admirer of Colbert and the French school, and hence was led to adopt a narrow and exclusive system. He had a natural genius for art and literature as well as war, and to the fame of a great general added that of a respectable author. His extravagant admiration of the French school served, however, rather to retard than promote the intellectual progress of his own subjects. The philosophical and freethinking principles which he had imbibed from the same school, as he forbore to force them upon his subjects, were perhaps on the whole beneficial, as they helped to introduce more tolerant views, and to mitigate the rabid bigotry which had too often characterized the professors of Lutheranism. These maxims, however, led him not to any relaxation in his method of civil government, and Prussia under his administration remained as complete a despotism as it had been under that of his predecessors.

Frederick II. was succeeded by his nephew, Frederick William II. The new Monarch seemed dispose to take more interest than his uncle in the affairs of Holland; and he had, immediately after his accession, sent Baron Görtz to the Court of the Stadholder. The negotiation of that Minister led, however, to no result. The views of the two parties were too opposite for conciliation; but an event which occurred towards the end of June, 1787, brought matters to a crisis. The consort of William V., a princess of a high spirit, resolved to visit the Hague, although her husband could not go thither. At Schoonhoven she was stopped by the troops belonging to the States of Holland, treated almost like a prisoner, and turned back. For this affront the Princess of Orange demanded vengeance at the hands of her brother the King of Prussia; but although the States of several Provinces disapproved of what had been done, the States-General, relying on the aid of France, refused to give befitting satisfaction. Frederick William II. seized the occasion to re-establish the Stadholder in his prerogatives. In September a Prussian army of 30,000 men, under the Duke of Brunswick, entered Holland. The dryness of the summer prevented the Hollanders from having recourse to inundation. Utrecht surrendered without a blow, and other places followed the example. The patriots, disunited

among themselves, found the *free companies*, which they had raised in imitation of the Middle Ages, and which they had placed under the command of the incapable Rhinegrave, Von Salms, totally unable to oppose an army of disciplined troops; while the nobles, who dreaded a popular government, favoured the Prussian invasion. The Prince of Orange entered the Hague, September 20th, after an absence of two years, amid the acclamations of the populace; Amsterdam surrendered, after a short resistance, October 10th, and the free companies were disarmed.

France made some show of assisting her ally, and declared, September 16th, that she would not suffer the Constitution of the United Provinces to be violated. But it was well known that the internal condition of France, now on the brink of a revolution, precluded her from all active interference. England declared that she would defend the Stadholder, if attacked, and prepared her fleets for action. The Court of Versailles submitted, and exchanged declarations with England, October 27th. The disgrace reflected on the French Government by these transactions assisted the designs of the revolutionary party in France. But the Stadholder, though thus restored by force of arms, did not overstep the limits of the Dutch Constitution. All the satisfaction he exacted was, that seventeen magistrates, directly concerned in the outrage upon his consort, should be deposed and declared for ever incapable of serving the Republic; and he cashiered several hundred officers who had borne arms against him. After establishing his authority, William proposed a general amnesty, from which only some of the ringleaders were excepted. Banished from their country, these turbulent men carried their democratic principles into France, and helped to foment the troubles of that Kingdom. By a solemn Act, signed by the various States, entitled *Act of Mutual Guarantee of the Seven United Provinces*, the hereditary dignities of Stadholder, Captain-General, and Admiral-General were declared an essential part of the Constitution.[1]

By the extinction of the patriot party an end was put to the alliance between the United Provinces and France. It was replaced by a treaty of mutual defence between Great Britain and the States-General, April 15th, 1788, by which Great Britain guaranteed the hereditary Stadholdership to the family of Orange. On the same day a defensive alliance was also signed at Berlin

[1] Among the authorities for this revolution are Jacobi, *Vollständige Gesch. der sieben jährigen Verwirrungen und der darauf erfolgten Revolution in den vereinigten Niederlanden*, Halle, 1789, 2 B. 8vo.; Ségur, *Tableau de l'Europe*, t. i. p. 342.

between the States-General and Prussia.[1] These treaties were followed by a defensive alliance between Great Britain and Prussia, concluded at Loo, in Gelderland, June 13th; renewed and confirmed by another treaty signed at Berlin on the 13th of the following August.[2] By a secret article England undertook to support Prussia, in case of need, with its whole naval power, and with an army of 50,000 men.[3] Thus was formed the TRIPLE ALLIANCE, which exercised for some years a decisive effect upon the affairs of Europe.[4]

The Emperor's conduct in selling the freedom of the Scheldt to the Dutch made him very unpopular in the Austrian Netherlands; and the attempt to exchange these Provinces for Bavaria, converted dislike into hatred. His Church reforms were also highly distasteful to that bigoted population. As in Austria, convents were dissolved, pilgrimages and spiritual brotherhoods abolished, appeals to the Pope forbidden, in short, all the measures adopted of an incipient Reformation. Towards the end of 1786 tumults broke out at Louvain, on the suppression of the episcopal schools in that city and the removal of the university to Brussels. The disturbance was increased by alterations in the civil government. An Ordinance of January 1st, 1787, abolished the various councils by which the Government was conducted, and established in their place a Central Board. Innovations were also made in the constitution of the courts of law. The boundaries of the provinces were soon afterwards altered, and the whole country was divided into nine Circles, each under a commissary named by the Court of Vienna. Symptoms of insurrection appeared at Brussels in April. De Hont, a merchant of that city, implicated in a criminal case, had been arrested and tried at Vienna, contrary to the privileges of the Brabanters, to be judged by their countrymen. The States of Brabant took up his cause, and declared that this violation of the *Joyeuse Entrée* prevented them from voting the annual supplies. A general fermentation ensued, which was increased by the manifest weakness of the Government. The States presented to the Archduchess Christina, Joseph's sister, who, with her husband, Duke Albert of Saxe Teschen, acted as governors, a list of their grievances in nine

[1] Hertzberg, t. ii. p. 444; Martens, t. iii. p. 133.

[2] Hertzberg, t. ii. pp. 449, 452; Martens, t. iii. pp. 138, 146.

[3] Zinkeisen, B. vi. S. 697.

[4] Namely, by compelling Denmark to desist from succouring Russia against Sweden; by dictating at Reichenbach the conditions of a peace between Austria and the Porte; by forcing Russia to renounce great part of her Turkish conquests; and by restoring tranquillity to the Austrian Netherlands.

heads. The Council of Brabant, or first court of justice, went still further, and abrogated all the new tribunals (May 8th). In consequence of a riot at Brussels towards the end of the month, the governors notified their resolution to maintain all the privileges of the States, and to revoke all regulations contrary to the *Joyeuse Entrée*. This compliance occasioned their recall. Count Trautmannsdorf was now appointed governor, with instructions to carry out the Imperial decrees, for which purpose military preparations were made. Negotiations, however, ensued; apparent reconciliations were repeatedly effected, and the final outburst was postponed for a year or two. But the latent discontent was not extinguished. A secret society was formed, with ramifications throughout the provinces, which numbered 70,000 persons, and matters wore an alarming aspect when Joseph entered upon a Turkish war, of which we must retrace the origin.

Joseph had cultivated a close friendship with the Czarina, Catharine II. He had flattered her vanity by paying her a visit at St. Petersburg in 1780, when it had been verbally agreed that, in case of a rupture with the Porte, Russia and Austria should aggrandize themselves at its expense. Magnificent projects were discussed. Catharine inflamed Joseph with the idea of seizing Italy and Rome, and establishing a real Empire of the West, while she should found at Constantinople a new Empire of the East.[1] This suggestion only struck an old chord in the traditional policy of Austria; but it was an apt snare for the restless and short-sighted ambition of Joseph, while the hope of more practical advantage lay on the side of Catharine. The friendship of the two Courts was cemented by a family alliance. Joseph's nephew, Francis, afterwards Emperor, was married to the younger sister of the Grand Duchess of Russia, and thus the presumptive heirs of two Imperial thrones became brothers-in-law. The King of Prussia, to efface the impression of the Emperor's visit, sent his nephew and heir, Prince Frederick William, to St. Petersburg. But a new and adverse influence reigned at that Court. After a long enjoyment of Catharine's favour, Gregory Orloff had been *disgraced* in 1772, and dismissed with presents of untold value. He was succeeded in his office by Alexander Wassiltschikoff, an officer in the Guards. But Catharine soon grew tired of a man whose only recommendation was his handsome person, and in

[1] We learn this fact from Joseph himself. See Dohm, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, B. i. 420.

1774 Wassiltschikoff was superseded by Potemkin. Gregory Alexandrowitsch Potemkin was the son of a Russian noble, and had played a subordinate part in the revolution which placed Catharine on the throne. His countenance was manly, but not prepossessing; his figure gigantic, but not well-proportioned; his temper violent and overbearing. He is said to have been the only man, except Orloff, who continued to retain his influence over Catharine after connections of a more tender nature had ceased. He obtained the conduct of affairs soon after his promotion, and continued to retain it till his death, though compelled, in 1776, to resign his more peculiar office to another. His brutal energy, which kept the nobles in awe, was useful to the Czarina.

Potemkin had long set his heart upon a war with Turkey, with the design of seizing the Tartar countries which had been declared independent by the Peace of Kutchuk Kainardji. With this view he employed himself in exciting disturbances in the Crimea. He compelled the Porte to restore the Khan Sahim Gherai, whom it had deposed, and who was in the Russian interest; and when the Turks assumed a threatening attitude against Sahim, supported him by sending an army under Suvaroff into the Crimea (1778). The Porte on its side had, indeed, afforded ground for complaint, and especially it had infringed on the Peace of Kainardji by opposing the passage of Russian vessels from the *White* Sea, or Egean, into the Black Sea. The war which seemed imminent was, however, averted by the mediation of France, and a new Convention was executed at Constantinople in March, 1779.[1]

Frederick II., with a view to maintain the peace of Europe, had proposed a quadruple alliance between Russia, Prussia, Poland, and the Porte. But he soon discovered that the Court of St. Petersburg regarded the Peace of Kainardji only as a stepping-stone to greater enterprises, and Catharine, on her side, abandoned an ally on whom she could no longer reckon. Thus was terminated the Russian and Prussian Alliance. The breach, perhaps, was not quite complete till the death, in 1783, of Count Panin, who had always favoured the Alliance; but Potemkin was the decided adversary of Prussia, and when, in 1782, the Grand Duke Paul and his wife made the tour of Europe, they were forbidden to visit Berlin.

After the Convention of 1779 further disputes arose between

[1] Called the *Convention of Ainali Karak*, from a Garden-palace near the arsenal, where it was signed.

Russia and the Porte, which, however, were amicably settled till the final explosion in 1789. Potemkin gradually induced Sahim Gherai, after renouncing his religion, even to abdicate his dominions in favour of Catharine, and to pass his life as her Lieutenant, in ease and luxury. A Russian manifesto had appeared in April, 1783, declaring the Crimea, the Isle of Taman, and the Province of Kuban on the other side of the Straits subject to the Russian sceptre, and Prince Potemkin took possession of them. Potemkin had diverted the pension assigned to the Khan to his own use; and when Sahim Gherai naturally complained of this wrong, he was banished from the Crimea,[1] which, together with the other Tartar lands, was occupied by Russian soldiers. The unfortunate inhabitants, who rose to assert their freedom, were put down with a terrible massacre, in which 30,000 persons perished of all ages and both sexes. The Turks at first acquiesced in these proceedings; and by a Convention between Russia and the Porte,[2] signed at Constantinople, January 8th, 1784, the domination of the Tartars was put an end to; but it was easy to see that a war would ensue so soon as an opportunity should offer itself.

Catharine now seemed to have made a step towards realizing her project of a new Eastern Empire. She adopted Voltaire's idea of erecting a new Greek Kingdom on the coasts of the Black Sea. The recently-acquired possessions received the names of Tauria and Caucasia, and Cherson was erected in the midst of a desert as the Capital of the new Kingdom, but on a site so ill chosen that it was soon eclipsed by Odessa. Potemkin, who was honoured with the pompous name of the "Taurian," was made Governor-General of the conquered Provinces, and Grand-Admiral of the Black Sea. But, under Russian government, the Tartar Provinces began rapidly to decline. Such were Potemkin's injustice and violence that the greater part of the inhabitants fled the country. Two years after their union with Russia these Provinces counted no more than 17,000 males; while in former times the Khan of Tartary had often appeared in the field with 50,000 horsemen.

The relations between Russia and the Porte continued to be uneasy. Disputes arose respecting the Turkish government in Moldavia and Wallachia, and on other points; whilst the Porte,

[1] He subsequently sought refuge in Turkey, where he was strangled as a traitor a few years after.

[2] This Convention will be found in Zinkeisen, *Gesch. des osm. Reiches*, B. v. S. 933 sq.

on its side, accused the Cabinet of St. Petersburg of frequent violations of the Peace of Kainardji. Catharine II. resolved, in 1787, to visit her new possessions, and to receive at Cherson the homage of her Tartar subjects during a grand festival in honour of the founding of that metropolis. After a visit to Kiev, she embarked on the Dnieper with her suite in a flotilla of twenty-two richly-decorated galleys (May 3rd). At Kaniev she had an interview with the King of Poland, her former lover, now her creature and victim. At Koidok she was met by the Emperor Joseph II., who, as usual, travelled *incognito* under the title of Count Falkenstein. Joseph had devotedly attached himself to her fortunes. Louis XVI. had endeavoured to dissuade his brother-in-law from the alliance; but Joseph had declared to the Court of Versailles, in August, 1783, that he would support the Czarina against the Turks with 120,000 men. The present position of his affairs had, however, somewhat cooled his ardour. As the two Sovereigns approached Cherson, large bonfires were kindled at every fifty rods, to enable them to travel by night. To give her new dominions an air of prosperity, Potemkin caused temporary villages to be erected along the route, which were peopled with inhabitants brought from afar, and dressed in holiday attire; while vast herds of cattle were grazing in the pastures. But, after Catharine had passed, villages, peasants, and herds vanished like a scene in a play, and left the country in its native solitude. At Cherson, one of the gates of which bore the ambitious inscription, "The road to Constantinople," Joseph paid assiduous court to the Czarina, and every morning attended her levée as a private individual. Future projects against Turkey were cautiously and suspiciously discussed during this journey, but no definite plans were formed, and neither Sovereign desired immediate war.[1] Catharine feared a diversion on the side of Prussia and Sweden, while Joseph received at Cherson alarming tidings respecting the state of Belgium. This position of affairs was favourable to Turkey, and the Divan listened to the exhortations of the English and Prussian residents not to let slip the opportunity of taking vengeance upon Catharine.[2] The Czarina, who had been scared from continuing her journey to Kinburn by the apparition of a Turkish fleet in the Liman, had scarcely returned to St. Petersburg, when the Russian Minister at Constantinople was arrested and confined in the Seven Towers, August 10th, 1787. At the same time war was declared against Russia. Chabaz Gherai was proclaimed Khan of the

[1] Zinkeisen, B. vi. S. 622. [2] Ségur, *Tableau hist. et pol. de l'Europe*, t. i. p. 93.

Tartars, and the Emperor was required to declare his views. Joseph replied that he was bound by treaties to Russia; and that he should repel force by force. But he offered to mediate a reconciliation; and he accompanied this declaration by placing a cordon of troops on the Hungarian frontier.

The war began with a fruitless attack of the Turkish fleet upon Kinburn, heroically defended by Suvaroff, September 24th. The winter was passed in negotiations. France attempted to mediate a peace, and would probably have succeeded, had not a courier of M. de Ségur, the French Minister at St. Petersburg, who was the bearer of Catharine's approval of a scheme of conciliation, been murdered on the road. In June, 1788, Potemkin crossed the Bug and invested Otchakov. The Turkish fleet, which had attacked the Russians in the Liman near that place, was totally defeated and destroyed, June 26th. Otchakov, after a furious resistance, was taken by assault, December 17th, the day of St. Nicholas, the patron saint of Russia. A dreadful massacre ensued, in which 0,000 persons are said to have lost their lives. Meanwhile Joseph II. had declared war against the Porte, February 9th, 1788. Two fruitless attempts to surprise Belgrade before the declaration threw a shade over the Austrian policy. The plan of the campaign was bad. The Austrian forces were weakened by being spread in five divisions over an extent of 800 or 900 miles from the Bukovina to the Adriatic. The Emperor led his division against Belgrade, but failed through dilatoriness. Prince Liechtenstein attempted Dubitza with the same result, which place, however, was taken by Loudon, August 26th, 1788. On the left wing Prince Coburg occupied a considerable part of Moldavia; but, on the whole, the campaign was unfavourable. The Grand Vizier Yussuf broke the Austrian centre and penetrated as far as Temesvar. The Turks were indeed compelled to evacuate the Banat before the end of autumn; but, on the whole, the campaign must be regarded as a failure; and the Emperor returned to Vienna ill and dispirited. One cause of this failure was the inefficiency of the Russians, hampered by an attack of Gustavus III. of Sweden. But to explain this event it will be necessary to take a brief review of the Scandinavian kingdoms.

During the Seven Years' War the faction of the *Hats* had reigned supreme in Sweden; but they lost their influence after the Peace, and in the Diet which assembled in 1765 the *Caps* contrived to seize the Government. To the people, however, this change was of little benefit. They were still oppressed by an

oligarchy differing but little from that which had been supplanted except in its views of foreign policy. The old King Adolphus Frederick was too fond of peace and tranquillity to attempt any changes in the State; but his son, the Crown Prince Gustavus, a nephew by his mother of Frederick the Great, had already begun to appear in public as the defender of the people against the oppressions of the nobles, and by his talents and popular qualities excited much admiration and enthusiasm. He had compelled the Council to convoke the States, before the usual period of assembly, in April, 1769; a step, however, which only resulted in the establishment of the *Hats*. In 1771 Gustavus made a journey to Paris; and he was in that metropolis when he heard of his father's death, on February 12th. Gustavus, while at Paris, entered into a solemn engagement with the French Ministry to bring about a Monarchical Revolution in Sweden. Yet, at this very time, he signed, at the demand of the Swedish Council, an Act of Security which they had forwarded to him, by which he promised to take on his return a solemn oath to the Constitution of 1720, and to regard as enemies of their country all who should attempt to restore the Kingly power.[1]

The talents and manners of Gustavus III. made him very popular at the beginning of his reign, and great hopes were entertained of him. The gold furnished to him by the French Court was applied to corrupt the soldiery, and the mutual hatred of the two prevailing factions was employed to work their own destruction. Gustavus was called upon at his coronation, which was celebrated with great pomp in May, 1772, to sign the Act of Security; but though he pledged himself by an oath to its observance, he declared that he had not read it, so great was his confidence in the States! and he was hypocritical enough to add that he had long taken the oath in his heart, being convinced that it was intended for the good of the nation. Yet he was already preparing the overthrow of the Constitution.

Gustavus was sure of the people. He had also formed a party, called the Court Party, which included many of the Hats; he had won the military, and especially the garrison of Stockholm, to which the Council, in order to retain its obedience, allowed double pay. In July, 1772, disturbances broke out in the remoter provinces. Rudbeck, one of the chief members of the oligarchy, who

[1] For this period of Swedish history see Sheridan, *Hist. of the late Revolution in Sweden* (Sheridan was secretary to the English Embassy in that country); Posselt, *Leben Gustavus III.*

had been despatched on this account to Gothenburg and Carlskrona, was refused admittance into the little fortress of Christianstadt. The King's brothers, Frederick Adolphus and Charles, began to put their regiments in motion in Schonen. The Council now appointed Funk, one of their body, governor of Scania, with dictatorial power; required the King to recall his brothers, placed patrols in the streets of Stockholm, and forbade the King to leave the city (August 19th, 1772). Gustavus at this crisis seemed immersed in the most frivolous amusements, such as designing patterns for embroidery, and other pursuits of the like kind. But under this veil he had prepared the blow which he meditated striking. On the very morning that the Council had thus declared war upon him, he repaired to that assembly and loaded them with the bitterest reproaches. He next proceeded to the main guard, and assembling the officers who were in his confidence, he addressed them with that popular eloquence for which he was famed, and persuaded all but three to sign a paper, transferring their allegiance to himself instead of the Council. By the common soldiers and the populace he was received with universal applause. His next step was to surround the Council in their chamber, and place a guard upon all the avenues. Then mounting his horse, he rode through the city, announcing with his own mouth the fall of the tyrannical oligarchs amid general acclamation. Before evening, Gustavus was undisputed master of Stockholm. In his address to the people on the following day, Gustavus assured them that he should claim only the limited prerogatives enjoyed by Gustavus Adolphus and Charles X. Yet the constitution, drawn up by himself, to which he compelled the Diet to swear by pointing his cannon on the assembly, invested him with extraordinary prerogatives, so that, in case of need, he was even empowered to levy new taxes, without the consent of a committee of the States. The King now dismissed the old Council, and appointed a new one entirely dependent on himself. But in spite of these arbitrary and unconstitutional proceedings, the first measures of Gustavus were highly popular. He abolished the abuses introduced by the late oligarchical government, and caused justice and order to flourish in the Kingdom.

This revolution deprived Russia of the influence she had hitherto exercised in Sweden by means of the prevailing anarchy. In order to regain it, Russian emissaries were constantly inciting the nobles against the Court. Gustavus, to revenge himself, seized the occasion of the Russian war with the Turks. He renewed the ancient

connection between Sweden and the Porte, and by treaties concluded in 1787 and 1788, engaged to attack Russia, on condition of receiving Turkish subsidies.[1] Catharine II. having equipped at Cronstadt in the spring of 1788 a fleet destined for the Mediterranean, Gustavus caused his brother, the Duke of Sudermania, to issue from Carlscrona with the Swedish fleet, while at the same time he assembled some troops in Finnland. Count Rasumoffski, the Russian Minister at Stockholm, hereupon presented a note demanding an explanation of these preparations; but as the note was addressed "to all those of the nation who participated in the government," Gustavus, instead of explaining, ordered Rasumoffski to quit the kingdom as a disturber of the public peace; and, on July 1st, he caused an ultimatum to be presented to Catharine, in which he demanded the punishment of Rasumoffski, the cession of Russian Finnland and Carelia with Kexholm, and the acceptance of Swedish mediation between Russia and the Porte. He also demanded that Catharine should disarm her Baltic fleet and recall her troops from Finnland, whilst he reserved to himself the right of remaining armed till a peace should be concluded with the Porte. Catharine replied by a declaration of war, July 11th.

The Swedes began the campaign by taking Nyslot and invading Carelia. Gustavus in person laid siege to Fredericksham, but either false news or want of provisions compelled him to raise it and retire to Kymenegord. Terror reigned at St. Petersburg. The Russian fleet had fought a drawn battle with the Swedish in the Gulf of Finnland. But the force of Gustavus was paralyzed by an unforeseen event. The news of preparations making in Norway by the Danes compelled him to return to Stockholm. He had scarce left the army when a number of officers assembled together, and alleging that the Constitution of 1772 forbade the King to undertake an offensive war without the consent of the States, required the Duke of Sudermania to propose an armistice; and, on the Duke's refusal, they sent a deputation to St. Petersburg to declare that the army would not pass the frontiers provided Catharine instructed her troops not to enter Finnland. Catharine gave the deputation a gracious reception; an armistice was agreed on, which the Duke of Sudermania was compelled to accept; and he retired from Russian Finnland.

The preparations making by Denmark to interfere in the contest recall our attention to that country, of whose history we shall

[1] Wenck, t. iii. p. 504.

offer a brief retrospect. Frederick V., who, towards the end of his life, grew somewhat weak and superstitious, died at the early age of forty-two, January 14th, 1766. He was a munificent patron of literature and science, and a favourer of courtly splendour; but for the people little was done, and the peasant remained the serf of the landed proprietor. He left a son only seventeen years of age, who succeeded him with the title of Christian VII. A generous, or rather, perhaps, a politic, act on the part of Catharine II. had, early in Christian's reign, attached Denmark to Russia. By a treaty, concluded in 1767, she had renounced, in the name of her son Paul, his pretensions to the Duchy of Schleswick, and agreed that the part of Holstein still governed in Paul's name should be reunited to Denmark.

The history of Denmark from Frederick's death down to the period at which we are arrived presents little of importance. A domestic tragedy forms its chief incident. Christian VII. married a English princess, Caroline Matilda, a sister of George III., who, in January, 1768, bore him a son and heir. In this year the young King, who had been badly educated, and whose mental weakness approached fatuity, was sent on a tour to England and France with a suite of near sixty persons, while his young consort remained at home. In Holstein the travellers were joined by a remarkable man, Struensee, town physician (*Stadtphysikus*) of Altona. Struensee, who was destined to exert a powerful influence both over Christian and his Kingdom, was a handsome, strong-built man, of witty and agreeable conversation. Bred up in an ascetic pietism by his parents, he had, like many talented persons of that age, ended with discarding all religion and becoming a disciple of the French philosophy. During this journey the King lost the little bodily and mental strength he had before possessed, and fell entirely under the influence of Struensee, who became Christian's body physician after his return to Copenhagen. Struensee now formed a criminal connection with the young Queen, Caroline Matilda; the imbecile and impotent Christian was brought entirely under their control; Count Bernstorf, Baron Holk, and the former ministers were removed; and Struensee, associating with himself Falkenskiold as commander-in-chief,[1] and Brandt, who succeeded to Holk's office of amusing the King, began in 177 to assume the entire direction of affairs. Struensee was an autocratic reformer, after the manner of Pombal in Portugal.

[1] The *Mémoires* of Falkenskiold, translated into French by Secretan (Paris, 1826), are the source for this period.

During his short tenure of office he is said to have issued no fewer than 600 reformatory decrees, many of which were highly salutary. He abolished the censorship of the Press; suppressed the many honorary titles which had crept in to an absurd extent during the preceding reign; abolished monopolies and reversions to vacated offices; reformed the relations between the peasants and landed nobles, as well as municipal corporations, the magistracy, the universities, courts of law, &c. He made debts recoverable by legal process from the highest noble as well as from the meanest citizen. He introduced economy into the military service by reducing the royal horse-guard. He also attempted some reforms in the Church, especially by abolishing most of the numerous holidays. In short, he tried to imbue Denmark, which was near a century behind the rest of Europe, with the spirit of the age, and with this view invited thither many foreigners distinguished by their learning or ability.

These innovations naturally produced great discontent and opposition among the privileged classes. Struensee had touched the interests of three powerful orders—the clergy, the army, and the nobles. Nay, with the best intentions for their welfare, he had contributed to offend the prejudices of the whole nation; for the greater part of the Danes, who were bigoted Lutherans, regarded Struensee, on account of his reforms in the Church, as no better than an atheist. The national prejudices were also shocked by the introduction of foreign teachers and outlandish ideas, and especially because the edicts of reform had been promulgated in the German language instead of the Danish. Hence, a "Danish" party was formed, in opposition to the "German," and these names became the watchwords of national antipathy. The widowed Queen Juliana, Christian VII.'s stepmother, who saw her own son Frederick neglected, retired from Court in disgust, and put herself at the head of the Danish party. The conduct of the young Queen Caroline and Struensee soon supplied this faction with the means of overthrowing them. In the well-known condition of Christian the birth of a princess had manifested the nature of the connection between Caroline and her Minister. Struensee, on his side, began to abuse his influence, and effaced the merit of his reforms by his ambition, avarice, and vanity. He enriched himself, while he forced economy on others; nay, elated with his success, he was even weak enough to assume some of the official titles which he had abolished, and he caused himself and his colleague Brandt to be created Counts. He lived in princely style in the royal palace

and instead of a democratic reformer made himself a sort of Dictator, with the title of Privy Cabinet Minister. All papers signed by him, and furnished with the cabinet seal, were to be regarded as valid as if they had received the royal signature.

In spite, however, of the opposition formed against him, Struensee might probably have maintained his hold of power had he possessed the requisite courage and resolution. But in the presence of danger this bold reformer did not show himself equal to the task which he had undertaken. He displayed his cowardice by flying with the whole Court from Copenhagen on the occasion of a riot of some 300 sailors, who compelled him to grant a request he had previously refused. He acted with equal pusillanimity on two or three other occasions. Thus he had determined to reduce the Norwegian guards, a privileged corps, and distribute them among the regiments of the line; yet, when a mutiny arose, he not only complied with their demand to be discharged, but even conciliated them by a distribution of money. By such instances of weakness he inspired his enemies with contempt as well as hatred, and encouraged them to work his ruin.

The chief instrument of his fall was Guldberg, a miller's son, a ci-devant student of theology, who, as tutor to Prince Frederick, had acquired great influence over the Queen Dowager. Under Guldberg's direction, a conspiracy was organized against Struensee, which included Queen Juliana, Prince Frederick, Rantzau, the Minister-at-War, and others. In the morning of January 17th, 1772, the chief conspirators, who had gained the military, suddenly entered Struensee's bed-chamber, and by working on his fears compelled him to sign the documents which they had prepared. Several orders of arrest were next extorted from the imbecile Christian, by virtue of which Queen Caroline Matilda, Struensee, Brandt, and ten of their colleagues were placed in confinement. The young Queen was conducted to Kronborg; Struensee and Brandt were cast into horrible dungeons and loaded with chains. Stupefied by the sense of his danger, and terrified by the threats of his judges, Struensee was induced to sign a full confession of his guilt with the Queen. But his hopes of saving his life by this step were disappointed. He and Brandt were executed, April 28th. Frankenskiold was banished to Funkholm Norway, and compelled to subsist on half-a-dollar a day; till length, in 1777, at the intercession of the Court of St. Petersburg, he was liberated and indemnified. Queen Caroline Matilda

signed a confession of her guilt, March 8th, 1772. Her trembling hand was able to form only the first four letters of her name, and was guided to the end by Baron Schak. A divorce was then pronounced between her and Christian VII.; but she was liberated from confinement and conveyed to Celle, in the Hanoverian dominions, where she died in 1775.

The hypocritical Guldberg was now triumphant, and ruled twelve years in Denmark under the modest title of Cabinet Secretary. He took an opposite course to Struensee. Instead of abolishing abuses he restored them, and introduced fresh ones. Thus he acquired the gratitude and favour of the nobles; but the people discovered that the restoration of Lutheranism did not involve the return of happiness, and began to regret the Minister over whose fall they had rejoiced. Guldberg ruled till 1784. Two years before he had dismissed the greatest ornament of this period, Peter Andrew von Bernstorf, nephew of the former Minister of that name, who to great talents united strict integrity. But in the year named the young Crown Prince succeeded in obtaining possession of his father's person, dismissed Queen Juliana, Guldberg, and their creatures, and restored Bernstorf to power.

Agreeably to its treaties with Russia, Denmark prepared to succour that Power in its war with Sweden. In September, 1788, an army of 20,000 Danes, under Prince Charles of Hesse-Cassel, invaded Sweden from Norway, and advanced as far as Uddevalla, near Gothenburg. Gustavus hastened into the northern provinces of his Kingdom, and by his popular eloquence incited the people to defend their country. The threats of the three allied Powers, England, Holland, and Prussia, to send a fleet to the help of the Swedish King, induced the Danes to withdraw from Sweden; an armistice was concluded under British mediation, and Christian VII. declared his neutrality.

In the Diet which assembled at Stockholm in January, 1789, the nobles manifested a disposition to oppose the King; but Gustavus, being supported by the other three estates, caused twenty-five of the nobles to be arrested, February 20th. On the following day he laid before the Diet a new Constitution, under the title of an "Act of Union and Surety:" its object was to increase the royal prerogative, and confer on the King the power of declaring war. This Act received the immediate assent of the clergy, burgesses, and peasants. The nobles rejected it, but the King compelled their speaker to affix his signature; and though this order protested, they agreed, like the rest, to furnish supplies

for the war. Hostilities continued during 1789 and 1790; but though a great many actions took place, both by sea and land, they were, for the most part, indecisive; and, with the exception of some of the maritime operations of 1790, which brought the war to a close, are scarcely worth detailing.

In May of that year Gustavus, after defeating the Russian galleys off Frederickshamn, proceeded to Wiborg, and disembarked troops within thirty leagues of St. Petersburg. Here he was joined by his brother, the Duke of Sudermania, with the main Swedish fleet. But meanwhile the Russian fleets, stationed at Cronstadt and Revel, had formed a junction, constituting a force of thirty ships of the line and eighteen frigates, and they now blockaded the whole naval power of Sweden, with the King himself, in the Gulf of Wiborg, during a period of four weeks. Provisions began to fail the Swedes, and the Russian commander, sure of his prey, proposed to Gustavus to surrender by capitulation. Fortunately, an easterly wind sprang up. The Swedes, taking advantage of it, and clearing the way by means of fireships, succeeded in forcing a passage; but with the loss of seven ships of the line, three frigates, and 5,000 men. Gustavus, who followed with the Swedish galleys, succeeded in escaping to Svenksund, but with the loss of thirty sail. The Russians, however, were subsequently defeated with great loss in an attack upon that place, and were thus hindered from any attempt upon Stockholm.

These events accelerated a peace. Russia, mistress of the Baltic, could no longer be prevented from sending a fleet into the Mediterranean; the aid of Sweden had therefore become useless to the Porte, and she could no longer reckon on subsidies from that quarter. It was known, too, that Catharine was negotiating a peace with the Porte, on the conclusion of which Sweden would be exposed to all the weight of her anger. But Catharine, on her side, was aware that the negotiations between Prince Potemkin and the Turks had been broken off, and that Austria was about to conclude a separate peace with them, which would leave Prussia and Poland at liberty to turn their arms against her. She therefore proposed a conference, which terminated in the Peace of Werela, on the strict *status quo ante bellum*, August 14th, 1790.[1] The progress of the French Revolution subsequently converted Gustavus and Catharine from personal enemies into warm friends and allies, and in October, 1791, an

[1] Martens, t. iii. p. 175.

alliance was concluded at Drottningholm, called the Treaty of Friendship and Union.[1]

We must now return to the Austro-Russian war with Turkey, the narrative of which was interrupted at the close of the campaign of 1788 (*supra*, p. 235).

Prince Repnin had now succeeded to the command of the Russian army of the Ukraine, and defeated the Turks, who had crossed the Danube at Ismail, September 20th, 1789. General Platoff, at the head of the Cossacks, took Akerman, or Bialogrod, at the mouth of the Dniester, October 13th; and Potemkin closed the campaign by the capture of Bender, November 14th. The Austrians had been equally fortunate, under the command-in-chief of General Haddik. Prince Coburg, in conjunction with Suvaroff, defeated the Turks at Fokchany, August 1st, and again at Martinesti, September 22nd; while Count Clairfait overthrew them at Mehadia, August 28th, and drove them from the Banat. But the chief hero of the campaign was Loudon, who took the suburbs of Belgrade by storm, September 30th, and compelled Osman Pasha and the Turkish garrison to capitulate, October 8th; Semendria and Passarowitz surrendered a few days after.

Meanwhile, Sultan Abdul Hamed had been carried off by a stroke of apoplexy, April 7th, 1789. His nephew and successor, Selim III., son of the unfortunate Mustapha III., a young Prince of twenty-eight years, possessing considerable energy and talent, resolved to prosecute the war with spirit; and he issued a decree commanding all the "Faithful," between sixteen and sixty years of age, to take up arms. But, like some of his predecessors, he acted with more zeal than discretion. Dressed as a sailor, or in other disguises, Selim went alone, by night as well as day, through the streets of Constantinople; he entered manufactories, shops, and coffee-houses, and endeavoured to learn the wants and wishes of the people from their own mouths.[2] By such a course, however, he was often led into error. By the revival of obsolete sumptuary laws, and the severity with which he enforced their provisions with respect to apparel, &c., he lost more hearts than he had gained by his apparent zeal for the welfare of his people.

Selim's warlike ardour suspended for a while the negotiations which the Court of Berlin, under the counsels of Hertzberg, had for some time been carrying on with the Porte, with the view of bringing about a peace. Frederick William II. had offered his

[1] Martens, t. v. p. 38.

[2] Zinkeisen, *Gesch. des osm. Reiches*, B. vi. S. 721.

mediation between Austria and the Porte: but the Emperor rejected it in an angry letter, in which he reproached the House of Hohenzollern with their encroachments ever since the days of Albert of Brandenburg.[1] The reverses suffered by the Turkish arms, in the campaign of 1789, favoured the renewal of these attempts on the part of Prussia, and a close alliance between that Power and the Porte was concluded at Constantinople, January 31st, 1790. By this treaty Prussia undertook to assist the Porte in the following spring with all her forces. But Diez, the Prussian Minister at Constantinople, exceeded his instructions. The Cabinet of Berlin, of which Hertzberg was still the director, had only contemplated a war against Austria; but Diez, instead of using the general expression "enemies of the Porte," specifically undertook to declare war "against the Russians and Austrians;" and inserted the "Crimea," by name, as one of the provinces to be recovered by the Sultan, although he had been instructed to avoid mentioning any particular provinces.[2] The King of Prussia delayed the ratification of the treaty till June 20th, when these clauses were evaded by adding the condition, "so far as it shall be in our power, and circumstances will permit;" while all mention of the Crimea was omitted; and the words "the provinces lost in the present war," substituted for it.[3] The Porte, on its side, promised to use its endeavours to procure the restitution of Galicia and the other Polish provinces seized by Austria, to the Republic of Poland.[4] In this piece of liberality towards that unfortunate country, Hertzberg, however, was not so disinterested as he seemed. His object in procuring the restoration of these provinces was to extort from Poland, Dantzic and Thorn in exchange for them. By the political relations then subsisting in Europe, this alliance assured to the Porte the friendship of Poland and Sweden, as well as the powerful intervention of Great Britain and Holland; which two Powers were to be the mediators of the future peace.

Soon after the conclusion of this treaty between Prussia and the Porte, the death of the Emperor Joseph II. (February 20th, 1790), also contributed to give a new turn to affairs. Although the success of the Austrian arms in the last Turkish campaign might serve to throw a cheering ray on Joseph's last days, yet the gloomy aspect of affairs in his own dominions is thought to

[1] It is given by Menzel, B. vi. S. 215. anm.
[2] Zinkeisen, B. vi. S. 749.
[3] The Ratifications are in Hertzberg, t. iii. p. 51 sq.; cf. Zinkeisen, B. vi. S. 781.
[4] Hertzberg, t. iii. p. 44; Martens, t. iv. p. 560.

have hastened his end. While the Prussians were preparing to strike a blow against him, discontent was increasing in Austria; an insurrection was daily expected to break out in Hungary; Tyrol was in a state of general ferment; and in the Netherlands Joseph had actually been deposed. The discontent in those provinces had continued to smoulder, and, in 1789, it burst into a flame.[1] Even the arbitrary act of Count Trautmannsdorf, in abolishing the *Joyeuse Entrée*, June 18th, did not produce an immediate insurrection. But the breaking out of the French Revolution encouraged the insurgents. The same cause also occasioned an insurrection in the bishopric of Liége, which then belonged to the Circle of Westphalia. An imperfect attempt of the Emperor to conciliate matters in the Netherlands served rather to aggravate than soothe the general discontent. By the Edict of August 14th, 1789, he re-established at Louvain the episcopal schools, but without suppressing the general seminary, and left to theological students the choice of either. In the following September, several thousands of the malcontents, with Cardinal Frankenberg, Archbishop of Mechlin, and the Duke of Arenberg at their head, crossed the frontier to Breda; and having formed a pretended assembly of the States, they addressed a remonstrance to the Emperor, demanding the restoration of the privileges enjoyed by Brabant from time immemorial, and threatening, in case of refusal, to appeal "to God and their swords." The people rose in arms under the conduct of Van der Meersch, a retired officer, who styled himself "General of the Patriots;" and they defeated 3,000 Austrians under General Schröder, who had attacked them at Turnhout. One Van der Noot, an advocate, who called himself "Agent of the Brabanters," now assumed the direction of the movement, and became for a time the virtual ruler of the Austrian Netherlands. In November the Austrian garrison was expelled from Ghent, and all Flanders renounced its allegiance. The Archduchess Christina and her husband quitted Brussels about the middle of that month, and soon after the Austrian troops were driven out, though Trautmannsdorf had, for a time, apparently re-established tranquillity by restoring the *Joyeuse Entrée*. A DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE was published in that capital, December 13th, 1789, to which the other provinces, with the exception of Luxembourg, acceded. Before the end of the year the Austrians were entirely expelled. On January 11th,

[1] For these events see Arendt, *Die Brabantische Revolution*, in Raumer's *Taschenbuch*, 1848.

1790, deputies from most of the provinces of the Austrian Netherlands having assembled at Brussels, signed an ACT OF UNION OF THE BELGIAN UNITED PROVINCES. The Government of the new Republic, which was of an aristocratic nature, was intrusted to a Congress; of which Cardinal Frankenberg was President, Van der Noot Prime Minister, and Van Eupen Secretary.

Such was the state of affairs at the death of Joseph II., a Monarch who appears to have sincerely desired the welfare of his subjects, but who undertook the impossible task of ruling them according to the philosophic ideas of his age, with the view of rendering them happy and enlightened in spite of their interests and prejudices, and, as it were, against their will. In Hungary he found it expedient to revoke all his innovations before his death, except the Edict of Toleration and the abolition of serfdom. He also sent back to that country the Holy Crown of St. Stephen, which was carried in triumph to Buda. In short, he summed up, not altogether inaccurately, his own political character in the epitaph which he proposed for himself a little before his death: "Here lies a Sovereign who, with the best intentions, never carried a single project into execution."[1] Personally, however, Joseph had many excellent qualities. He was industrious, he mixed freely with his people, and permitted even the meanest of them to approach him. To a courtier, who proposed to reserve a portion of the Augarten for the higher classes, he replied: "If I wished to mix only with my equals, I must spend my life among the coffins of my ancestors in the Imperial vault." He declined a proposal of the inhabitants of Buda to erect a statue to him, with some remarks which may serve to show his ideal of a State. He observed that he should deserve a statue when prejudices were extirpated, and genuine patriotism and correct views of the public good established in their stead; when everybody should contribute his proportion to the necessities and security of the State; when the whole of his dominions should be enlightened by means of improved education, a simpler and better teaching of the clergy, and a union of religion and law; when a sounder administration of justice should be introduced, wealth increased by augmented population and improved agriculture, better relations established between the nobles and their dependents, and trade and manufacture put on a better footing.[2] But the harshness

[1] Coxe, *House of Austria*, vol. ii. p. 661. In this epitaph, however, Joseph was a little too severe upon himself. His revocations related only to Hungary and the Netherlands; while the regulations which he made for his other dominions continue still in force. See Menzel, B. vi. S. 252.

[2] Menzel, B. vi. p. 255.

with which he enforced minute and vexatious police regulations deprived him of the popularity which his many good qualities were calculated to attract.

Joseph II. died at the age of forty-eight, and in the tenth year of his reign. Although he had been twice married,[1] he left no living issue, and he was therefore succeeded as King of Hungary and Bohemia, and in the Sovereignty of Austria, by his brother Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany. Leopold had ruled Tuscany twenty-five years, with the reputation of liberality and wisdom. Like his brother Joseph, he had sought to reform the Church, and had seconded the efforts of Scipio Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, for that purpose. An assembly of all the Jansenist prelates and clergy of Tuscany, which Ricci had convoked in the metropolis of his see in 1787, drew up the projects of reform, celebrated as the *Propositions of Pistoia*. In these Propositions the Papal power was questioned, the showy and merely external worship introduced by the Popes was condemned, and the strict morality of the Jansenists declared the essential principle of Christianity. Pius VI., who then filled the Papal throne, threatened Ricci with excommunication. But the firm attitude of Leopold, who forbade all appeals to Rome, refused to recognize the spiritual powers of the Nuncio, and abolished the dependence of the religious orders on foreign superiors, deterred the Pope from proceeding to this extremity. Such reforms, however, were as distasteful to the mass of the Italians as they were to the Austrians. The populace regarded Ricci as a heretic, and on that score thought themselves justified in plundering his palace. The Propositions of Pistoia were condemned by a small assembly of prelates at Florence, dignified with the name of a general synod; and Pius had only to await with patience a reaction, which soon dissipated the reforms of the Tuscan clergy.[2] Equal liberality was observed in Leopold's civil administration. He mitigated the rigour of the penal laws, and abolished capital punishment, even in cases of murder. Observing that this mildness was attended with beneficial effects, he introduced, in 1786, his celebrated Code, by which the criminal law was entirely revised, and the prosecution and punishment of offenders reduced to a *minimum* of harshness and severity.

Leopold, who was forty-three years of age at the time of his

[1] First to Maria Isabella of Bourbon, daughter of Don Philip, Duke of Parma; by whom he had two daughters who died young. His second wife was Josepha of Bavaria, daughter of the Emperor Charles VII., by whom he had no issue. His second wife was distasteful to him, and he never married again, but he indulged in promiscuous amours, which sometimes endangered his health.

[2] See *Mémoires sur Pie VI. et son Pontificat.*

brother's death, immediately left Florence for Vienna. The political atmosphere, as we have seen, was anything but clear. Leopold felt that the most pressing necessity was to accommodate matters with Prussia. Immediately after his arrival in Vienna, he addressed a letter to the King of Prussia, in which he expressed a desire for his friendship, and candidly declared that, as an indemnity for the expenses of the war with Turkey, he should be content with the boundaries assigned to Austria by the Peace of Passarowitz in 1718; and he concluded with assurances of moderation with regard to his future policy.[1] He did not, however, neglect the precautions rendered necessary by the attitude assumed by Prussia, and ordered an army of 150,000 men to assemble in Moravia and Bohemia; although this step compelled him to reduce his forces on the Danube. Frederick William replied in a conciliatory autograph letter, in which he intimated that he could not act without the concurrence of his allies (April 15th). At this juncture England proposed an armistice to Prussia and the belligerents, in order to treat for a peace on the *status quo ante bellum;* but the proposal failed, chiefly through the obstinacy of Kaunitz, now an old man of eighty, whose senile caprices were treated with great deference by Leopold, although opposed to his own convictions.[2] After the rejection of the armistice Prussia submitted the following project for a peace: That Austria and Russia should restore to the Porte all the territory they had conquered between the Danube and Dniester; Austria, however, retaining those parts of Wallachia and Servia which had been assigned to her by the Peace of Passarowitz, but restoring Galicia to Poland, except the district from the borders of Hungary and Transylvania to the rivers Dniester and Stry. In order to restore the balance between Austria and Prussia, the latter country was to have Dantzic and Thorn. On these conditions Frederick William II. agreed not to oppose Leopold in the Netherlands, and to vote for him as Emperor.[3] The Prussian note accompanying these proposals was peremptory, almost challenging. Austria declined the terms offered, on the ground that the districts assigned to her were no equivalent for the sacrifices required of her, and that it was unreasonable to demand that peace should be made at her expense.

[1] Hertzberg, *Recueil de Déductions*, t. iii. p. 61.

[2] See *Memoirs and Correspondence* of Sir R. M. Keith (the British Minister at Vienna), *Despatch* to the Duke of Leeds, July 11th, 1790, vol. ii. p. 277 sqq. The Emperor, when he had any business to transact, was obliged to go to Kaunitz's house, as he never came to Court. *MS. Journal, ibid.* p. 290 note.

[3] Hertzberg, t. iii. p. 74.

Both parties now prepared for war. Loudon resigned the command on the Danube, to place himself at the head of the Austrian army on the frontier of Saxony. The main body of the Prussians, under the King, the Duke of Brunswick, and General Möllendorf, assembled in Silesia; another division was stationed in East Prussia, on the borders of Lithuania, and a third in West Prussia, towards the Vistula. It was in his camp at Schönwald that Frederick William ratified his treaty with the Porte, as already mentioned (June 20th). But in spite of these hostile demonstrations, both Sovereigns were secretly longing for peace. Leopold wished to allay the intestine disorders of his dominions; Frederick William apprehended that his proposals might be distasteful to Poland and the Porte; while both Monarchs were filled with alarm at the rapid progress of the French Revolution. Fresh negotiations were, therefore, opened at Reichenbach, a town in the principality of Schweidnitz. Russia refused to take part in them, having resolved to treat separately with the Porte. Hertzberg, bent on carrying his views against Austria, even at the risk of a war, endeavoured to exclude England from the Conference, because that Power, as well as Holland, advocated the strict *status quo ante bellum;* and they had declared that if Prussia should persist in her scheme of indemnification, and a war should be thereby kindled, they should not consider it a *casus fœderis,* and should forbear to take any part in it. Lucchesini, too, the Prussian Minister at Warsaw, dissuaded the irresolute Frederick William from adopting Hertzberg's policy; which he and others represented as the offspring of a false ambition, and a blind and passionate hatred of Austria.[1]

Leopold's firmness had almost occasioned the breaking-off of the negotiations, when they suddenly took a new turn. A party had sprung up in Poland which opposed the cession of Dantzic and Thorn, its only ports, and preferred to renounce Galicia. As this party was supported by the Maritime Powers, Frederick William deemed it prudent to postpone his endeavours to obtain those places till a more convenient opportunity. In revenge, the Prussian Cabinet required that Austria should give up Turkish Wallachia, and signified that the non-acceptance of this condition within ten days would be considered a declaration of war. Leopold consented to accept the strict *status quo ante bellum.* As there had been no war between Austria and Prussia, those two Powers contented themselves with reciprocal declarations, which were combined in

[1] Sir R. M. Keith characterizes them as "schemes of *partition, exchange,* and *depredation.*"—*Memoirs,* vol. ii. p. 361.

the Convention of Reichenbach,[1] signed August 5th, 1790. On the 21st of the same month an armistice was concluded at Giurgevo, between Austria and the Porte. Before its conclusion the Austrians had gained some advantages in the campaign of that year. Old Orsova had capitulated to them, April 16th, and some successes had been achieved in Wallachia.

It was not till January, 1791, that a congress for the establishment of peace between Austria and the Porte was opened, under the mediation of England, Holland, and Prussia, at Sistova, a town in Bulgaria. During its progress, the Austrians, raising a distinction between the *status quo de jure* and *de facto*, made some new demands, which they ultimately carried; not, however, in the treaty, but by a separate convention with the Porte, by which the latter ceded Old Orsova and a district on the Unna. The Porte retained Moldavia and Wallachia. The Peace of Sistova and the Convention were signed on the same day, August 4th, 1791.[2]

The reconciliation with Prussia had many beneficial results for Leopold. Besides promoting the Peace of Sistova, it enabled him to put down the disturbances in the Netherlands and Hungary, and helped him to the Imperial Crown. The three allied Powers did not wish to see Austria deprived of the Belgian provinces by a revolution, though they wanted her to make a new barrier treaty. After the Congress of Reichenbach had settled the affairs of Turkey, the Prussian Minister delivered to those of Austria a declaration of the Maritime Powers, expressing their readiness to guarantee, in conjunction with Prussia, the constitution of the Austrian Netherlands, and to take the necessary steps to bring them again under the dominion of the House of Austria. On intelligence of this, the Brussels Congress sent deputies to London, Berlin, the Hague, and Paris, to make remonstrances and demand succours. Leopold, before he left Florence, had declared his disapproval of the innovations of his predecessor in the Netherlands, had promised a complete amnesty, confirmed the *Joyeuse Entrée*, and even extended the privileges of his rebellious subjects; but without effect. An army of 20,000 men was raised, and placed under the command of Van der Noot; but this force, which attacked the Austrians on the Meuse, in the autumn of 1790, was beaten in almost every rencounter. It had been settled at Reichenbach to hold a congress at the Hague, which was opened in September, and attended by Austrian, Prussian, English, and Dutch Ministers. The Belgian provinces also sent deputies; but as they still

[1] Hertzberg, t. iii. p. 103 sqq. [2] Martens, t. v. p. 18.

continued refractory, and demanded that France should be associated in the negotiations, the mediating Powers declared, October 31st, that unless they made their submission within three weeks, they would be abandoned to their fate. This declaration was in accordance with a manifesto published by Leopold at Frankfort, on the 14th of that month, announcing that if the Netherlanders should not have returned to their duty by November 21st, he should cause an army of 30,000 men to enter their provinces. The insurgent States made use of the last moments of their independence to offer the sovereignty to Leopold's third son, the Arch duke Charles. This step, however, did not arrest the march of the Austrians, under Field-Marshal Bender. They entered Namur, November 24th, and Brussels, December 2nd, when the rest of the Belgian towns submitted. On December 10th the Ministers of the Emperor and the mediating Powers signed, at the Hague, a definitive convention,[1] and the provinces sent deputies to tender their submission. The Netherlanders were guaranteed in their ancient rights and privileges, with some new concessions, and a general amnesty, containing only a few exceptions, was proclaimed. The Republic of the Belgian Provinces had lasted scarce a year. The Archduchess Christina and her husband, the Duke of Saxe Teschen, made their solemn entry into Brussels, June 15th, 1791; but though the aristocratic and more powerful party, which was in favour of kingly government, had submitted, democratic disturbances, in connection with the dominant faction in France, still continued.

The disturbances in Hungary had also been calmed. Leopold was quietly crowned at Pressburg, November 15th, 1790. The Emperor's son, Alexander Leopold, whom the Hungarians had unanimously elected their Palatine, assisted in placing the Crown upon his father's head. The new King of Hungary had, in the previous October, received at Frankfort the German and Imperial Crown, to which he had been unanimously elected, with the title of Leopold II. Leopold's government in the Austrian dominions was reactionary. One of his most important regulations was the introduction of the secret police, which he had established in Tuscany, principally, it is said, for his amusement. Leopold died suddenly, March 1st, 1792, in consequence of errors in diet, and the use of incentives which he prepared himself. He was forty-five years of age at the time of his death. He had had sixteen children, of whom fourteen survived him. He was succeeded in

[1] Martens, t. iii. p. 342.

the Austrian Monarchy by his eldest son, Francis, then twenty-five years of age, who, in the following July, was elected and crowned at Frankfort, with the Imperial title of Francis II. Leopold had invested his second son, Ferdinand, with the Grand Duchy of Tuscany.

Meanwhile the war had continued between Russia and the Porte. The campaign of 1790 began late. Under Potemkin, Suvaroff, and other generals, the Russians captured Kilia Nova, October 29th, and two or three other places subsequently surrendered. But the grand feat of the year was the taking of Ismail by assault, by Suvaroff, December 22nd. This desperate enterprise was not achieved without great loss on the part of the Russians, who stained their victory by the horrible butchery which they committed. The campaign on the Kuban and in the Caucasus was also favourable to the Russians. Several engagements took place at sea. A bloody but indecisive battle was fought near the Gulf of Yenikale, July 19th, 1790, and, on September 9th, Admiral Ouschakoff entirely defeated the Turkish fleet near Sebastopol.

Fortune also favoured the Russian arms in 1791. The principal event in the campaign of that year was the defeat of the Grand Vizier, Yussuf Pasha, by Prince Repnin, near Matchin, July 10th. The victory was chiefly due to General Kutusoff, who commanded the Russian left wing. On the 3rd of the same month, General Gudowitsch, with the army of the Caucasus, took Anapa, the key of the Kuban. On August 11th, Admiral Ouschakoff, after a severe engagement, defeated the Turkish fleet off Kara Burur, or the Black Cape. But on that very day the preliminaries of a peace had been signed at Galatz.

Catharine II. having refused to accede to the Congress of Reichenbach, or to accept the mediation of Prussia with the Porte, Frederick William put a large army on foot; and Great Britain declared to the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, that, whether the mediation of the allied Powers were accepted or not, she should demand for the Porte the strict *status quo ante bellum*. In pursuance of this declaration a large fleet, destined for the Baltic, was equipped in the English harbours, and the Dutch were called upon to furnish their contingent. But a war with Russia was very unpopular in England, on account of the lucrative commerce with that country. It was warmly opposed by Fox and Burke; Pitt himself was not anxious for it; and the retirement of the Duke of Leeds, the Foreign Secretary, who was succeeded by Lord Grenville (April, 1791), marked the adoption of a more

pacific policy. Shortly before the allies had obtained the consent of Denmark to act as mediator between Russia and the Porte; a mediation which Catharine accepted. She continued, however, to reject the strict *status quo*, though she was not unwilling to accept a modified one, which should give her Otchakov and its territory; and in this demand she was supported by Count Bernstorff, who, as Danish Minister, conducted the mediation; but on condition that the fortifications of Otchakov should be razed. The allies consented; new propositions were made to Catharine on this base, and, after considerable negotiation, preliminaries were signed, August 11th, at Galatz, between Prince Repnin and the Grand Vizier. The negotiations for a peace were transferred to Jassy, whither Prince Potemkin hastened from St. Petersburg to conduct them. The idea of a peace was very distasteful to Potemkin, who was in hopes of obtaining Moldavia and Wallachia for himself, as an independent principality; nor did he altogether despair of attaining that object by his negotiations. But the sittings of the Congress had scarcely begun when he was seized with a malignant fever then raging in those parts; and to which, perhaps, the agitation of his spirits contributed to give a fatal result. He left Jassy, October 15th, for his favourite residence, Nicolajeff. But it was not permitted him to reach it. He died on the road the following day, in the arms of his favourite niece, the Countess Branicka. The PEACE OF JASSY was signed January 9th, 1792. The Dniester was now established as the boundary between the Russian and Turkish Empires, and thus Otchakov was tacitly assigned to Russia; which Power restored to the Porte its other conquests.[1]

We must now revert, in a fresh chapter, to the States of Western Europe, and especially to France; of the affairs of which country our account has been brought down to the Peace of Paris (above, p. 185 sq.).

[1] Martens, t. v. p. 67. Also in Wilkinson's *Moldavia and Wallachia*, p. 230 sq.

CHAPTER LI.

IN the events which agitated Eastern Europe since the Peace of Paris in 1763, as recorded in the two preceding chapters, we cannot help observing the decline of the political influence of France. That Power seemed to be no longer the same which had dictated the Peace of Westphalia, and during the reign of Louis XIV. had terrified all Europe by her arms and embroiled it by her negotiations. An abstinence so repugnant to her natural temper was imposed upon her by the necessities of her internal condition, and especially by the disorder of her finances. So great was her need of repose, that one object alone, the desire of striking a blow at England, might tempt her to draw the sword. The Peace of Paris was felt as a humiliating blow by both the Bourbon Courts, and especially by that of Versailles. The Duke de Choiseul, in conjunction with Grimaldi, Minister of Charles III. of Spain, made some endeavours to reopen the treaty of 1763, and renew the war with England. Circumstances, however, were not yet ripe for such an undertaking, and they deemed it prudent to defer their projects of revenge to a more favourable opportunity. A diabolical scheme which they had formed (1764), to burn the dockyards at Portsmouth and Plymouth, was fortunately discovered in time by Lord Rochford, our Ambassador at Madrid, and happily frustrated.[1]

As the financial embarrassments of France paralyzed her foreign policy, so the profligate conduct of Louis XV. and his Court was daily alienating the people and producing in their minds that disgust and aversion which ultimately overthrew the Monarchy. The death of Louis's mistress, Madame de Pompadour, in 1764, was only followed by a deeper plunge into vice and shame, by the now elderly Monarch. He seemed, indeed, for a while, to be awakened to a sense of repentance and amendment by the death of his ill-used consort, Maria Leczynska, in June, 1768; but these symptoms were of short duration. In the autumn of that year his valet de chambre Lebel, the purveyor of his infamous pleasures,

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 317.

introduced to his notice one Jeanne Vaubernier, a woman of abandoned character, the mistress of the proprietor of a tennis court. This creature at once acquired a complete ascendency over the sensual Monarch. He married her to an elder brother of her former keeper, created her Countess du Barri, and introduced her at Court, nay, even to his own daughters. It might be derogatory to history to narrate these particulars, but for the fact that, under the ancient *régime*, the reigning mistress too often controlled the destinies of France. Such was the case in the present instance. The pride of Choiseul forbade him to court the infamous favourite; and he even tried to awaken Louis to a sense of his disgrace in "succeeding all France." His indignation, which we cannot characterize as entirely virtuous, appears to have been sharpened by disappointment. His sister, the Duchess de Gramont, had failed to attract the notice of the King, and found herself supplanted not only by a woman without reputation, but even a *roturière*. The new mistress, however, was supported by the Chancellor Maupeou, and by the Duke d'Aiguillon, a bitter enemy of Choiseul's, who had formerly purchased the King's favour by sacrificing to him his mistress, Madame de la Tournelle, afterwards Duchess of Châteauroux. In about a year the intrigues of this faction effected the overthrow of Choiseul. Louis dismissed that Minister, December 24th, 1770, on the ground that he had nearly involved France and Spain in a war with England, and in a letter brutally abrupt, directed him to proceed forthwith to his château of Chanteloup.

The annexation of Corsica to France was among the last acts of Choiseul's administration. That island had been under the dominion of the Genoese since the year 1284, when they had conquered it from the Pisans. The government of the Genoese Republic had been harsh and tyrannical. The cruelty exercised by its agents in collecting the taxes had occasioned an insurrection in 1729; since which time the island had been in a constant state of anarchy and semi-independence. They elected their own chiefs, and in 1755 they had chosen for their general the celebrated Pascal Paoli, second son of Hyacinth Paoli, one of their former leaders. Pascal Paoli, whose father was still alive, was now in his thirtieth year. He held a command in the military service of Naples, and was distinguished by his handsome person as well as by his abilities and courage. Having established himself at Corte, in the centre of the island, he organized something like a regular government, and diverted the ferocious energy

of the Corsicans from the family feuds in which it found a vent, to a disciplined resistance against the common enemy. The French had assumed the part of mediators between the Genoese and their rebellious colonists as early as 1751. That Republic had succeeded in retaining only some of the maritime places; and three of these had been occupied by the French in 1756, but without hostilely interfering between the contending parties, and only in their quality of mediators. The occupation, however, was abandoned at the end of two years; till, in 1764, the Genoese having experienced the difficulty, not only of subduing the rebels, but even of retaining the places which they held, besought the French to return; and by the Treaty of Compiègne put into their hands for a term of four years Ajaccio, Calvi, Bastia, and San Fiorenzo. The Corsicans made a fruitless attempt to induce France to recognize their independence by offering the same tribute which they had been accustomed to pay to the Genoese. It may be mentioned, as illustrating the degree to which the philosophical notions then prevalent had affected the minds even of practical men, that Colonel Buttafuoco, the Corsican agent, was instructed to request the groundwork of a constitution from the pen of J. J. Rousseau, and to invite that philosopher to Corsica in the name of Paoli's government. The French Court behaved disloyally both towards their allies the Genoese and to the Corsicans. The latter were deceived with false hopes; while, during a four years' occupancy, a debt was contracted which the Republic of Genoa was unable to discharge. The Genoese, too proud to recognize the independence of their rebellious subjects, made over Corsica to France for a sum of two million francs, May 15th, 1768. The Corsicans resolved to defend themselves, but in the following year were subdued by superior forces, and placed under the government of France. These proceedings excited great indignation in England. General Paoli and many of his companions fled their country. Paoli came to England, where he was fêted and caressed; but the English Government did nothing for Corsica, and ultimately acquiesced in its subjection.[1]

Among the causes of Choiseul's fall was the part which he had taken against the Duke d'Aiguillon. That nobleman had been accused of maladministration in his office of Governor of Brittany, and a process had been instituted against him in the Parliament

[1] See Klose, *Leben Pascal Paolis*. Anecdotes of Paoli's residence in England will be found in Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. He died in London, February 5th, 1807, and was buried at St. Pancras.

of Rennes. The King evoked the suit before the Parliament of Paris; and finding that body hostile to his favourite, he annulled their proceedings in a *Lit de Justice*, and published an Edict infringing the privileges of the Parliament. That body tendered their resignation, and refused to resume their judicial functions, though commanded to do so by the King, till the obnoxious Edict should be withdrawn. The Court solved the question by a *coup d'état*. On the night of January 19th, 1771, the members of the Parliament were awakened in their beds by the Royal *musquetaires*, with a summons from the King to declare *yes* or *no*, whether they would resume their functions. All but thirty or forty refused. Even these, having speedily retracted, were sent into exile, as their refractory comrades had been before, and the Council of State was charged with the provisional administration of justice. These proceedings were followed by others still more arbitrary and illegal. The Parliaments throughout the Kingdom were entirely suppressed, and in their place six Superior Councils (*conseils supérieurs*), with power to pronounce judgment without appeal, except in a few cases, both in civil and criminal causes, were erected in the towns of Arrâs, Blois, Châlons, Clermont-Ferrand, Lyon, and Poitiers. For the Parliament of Paris was substituted a body of seventy-five persons, nominated by the King, whose places, therefore, were neither purchased nor hereditary as formerly, and who were forbidden to take presents (*épices*) from suitors. This body was nicknamed, after its contriver, the *Parlement Maupeou*.

All this was done under the colour of reform and intellectual progress, affected in those days by the most arbitrary Sovereigns. Louis XV. was to figure as a liberal with Frederick II. of Prussia, Catharine II. of Russia, and Joseph II. of Austria. The preamble of Maupeou's Edict, abolishing the Parliaments, developed ideas designed to attract the *philosophers*, and really succeeded in catching some of the Encyclopædists, including their chief and patriarch, Voltaire. Nor can it be denied that some of the alleged motives were sufficiently specious. Thus Maupeou took credit for abolishing the sale of offices, which often prevented the admission of persons into the magistracy who were most worthy of it; and for rendering the administration of justice both prompt and gratuitous, through the suppression of the Judges' fees, and by relieving, through the establishment of the *conseils supérieurs*, provincial suitors from the necessity of going to Paris.[1] Nor, if

[1] Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 284.

we regard the political functions assumed by the Parliament of Paris, was there much to regret in its fall. Never, surely, was a political machine invented of so much pretension and so little power. A Royal Edict was of no avail till sanctioned and registered by the Parliament; yet, if this sanction was withheld, the King had only to hold a *Lit de Justice*, and enforce compliance. A body so constituted, and composed principally of one class in the State, could never hope to be a constitutional power; and, accordingly, its resistance to the Royal will, though sometimes productive of serious disturbance, always ended in defeat. Nevertheless, the abolition of the Parliaments was unpopular with the great majority of the French nation. In the first place, the Ministry from which these reforms proceeded was not only suspected, but despised. The Parliaments, again, despite the vices of their constitution, were really popular. They were the only exponents of the national voice; and in general the members, whose dignity and independence were secured by their places being hereditary, though purchased, had shown themselves the friends of liberty and progress. The people recollected that it was they who had opposed the feudalism and Ultramontanism of the Middle Ages, and that to them alone they could now look for any barrier against Regal despotism. These sentiments were shared by many of the very highest rank. Out of twenty-nine Peers present, eleven had opposed the registry of the Edicts against the Parliaments; and what seemed still more serious, all the Princes of the blood Royal, except one, had protested against the proceedings of the Court, and even denied the King's power to issue such an Edict as that of the *Lit de Justice*. The Advocate-General Séguier, had, at the time, warned the King to his face against the course he was pursuing, and bade him remember that even in the greatest Monarchies, disregard of the laws had often been the cause or the pretext of revolutions.

This blow against the State had been preceded a few years before by one against the Church. Choiseul, in conjunction with Madame de Pompadour, had effected the expulsion of the Jesuits from France; and it has been thought that the fall of that Minister was hastened by the revenge and intrigues of the disciples of Loyola. The fall of the Jesuits concerns the general history of Europe, and we have, therefore, abstained from touching on it, till it could be narrated in its totality. We have already said that this movement originated in Portugal, and was the work of Pombal. To the influence of the Jesuits it was ascribed that

the weak and superstitious John V. had annihilated all hope of progress, by throwing his Kingdom entirely into the hands of the clergy; and this circumstance is the best justification of Pombal's harsh and arbitrary proceedings against the Society. Amidst the enlightenment of the eighteenth century, the conduct of John might have befitted the most benighted period of the Dark Ages. Among other instances of his extravagance may be mentioned the foundation of the Royal Convent of Mafra, at an expense of forty-five million crusades, or near four millions sterling. In one wing of this building 300 lazy Franciscans were lodged in regal splendour; their church occupied the centre, and the other wing formed the King's Palace! John founded a patriarchate in Lisbon, and towards the end of 1741 caused at least a hundred houses to be pulled down in that city, in order to build a patriarchal church and palace. In 1744, after recovering from an attack of sickness, he summoned to his Court four-and-twenty prebendaries, whom he had instituted, gave all a cap, violet stockings, red shoes, a golden hat-band, and a cardinal's staff; conferred upon them ducal rank, with an income of 2,000 crusades apiece, and on the following day enjoyed the spectacle of seeing them perform divine service in their new attire. The Civil Government was also under ecclesiastical control, and promulgated the strangest regulations. Thus, for instance, the importation of costly manufactures in gold, silver, silk, fine stuffs, &c., was suddenly prohibited, except such as were to be used by the clergy, and in the churches. The liberty to display his whims and caprices in Church matters was bought by John at a high price from the Court of Rome, and no country was more profitable to the Papal Court than the little Kingdom of Portugal. Hence he earned from Pope Benedict XIV. the equivocal title of *Fidelissimus*, which might signify his excessive devotion either to the Holy See or to Christ.

In these and the like acts there was enough to excite the bile of a less fiery reformer than Pombal. That Minister regarded the Church, and especially the Jesuits, as the chief authors of the declining state of the Kingdom; and he had been further incensed against that Society by their conduct in Paraguay. Through the influence of John V.'s daughter, Barbara, who had married Ferdinand VI. of Spain, a settlement had been effected, in 1750, of the long disputes respecting the colony of San Sacramento on the river Plata, which had been assigned to Portugal by the Treaty of Utrecht. Portugal abandoned that colony to Spain, receiving in return the town and district of Tuy, in Galicia, and the Seven

Missions of Paraguay. The native Indians of this district were to be transferred to Spanish soil; but their rulers, the Jesuits, incited them to oppose this arrangement, and for some time they succeeded in resisting the 3,000 or 4,000 Spaniards and Portuguese, under the command of the Commissaries appointed to effect the exchange. Pombal despatched his brother with a considerable army, in 1753, to put an end to the dominion of the Jesuits; which, however, was not effected till 1756. Meanwhile, the great earthquake of Lisbon had taken place. The Jesuits did not let slip so favourable an opportunity for working on the superstition of the people. Pombal was denounced from the pulpits, and the earthquake was appealed to as the visible judgment of God upon his profanity.

The Portuguese Minister was not a man to be daunted by such attacks. He resolved on the destruction of the Jesuits. His first victim was Malagrida, apparently a harmless fanatic, if fanaticism ever can be harmless. Gabriel Malagrida, the inventor of certain mechanical spiritual exercises which he alone could conduct, had obtained the odour of sanctity by setting afloat, through the efficacy of his prayers, a ship which had been stranded; but, regardless of these merits, the Minister banished Saint Gabriel to Setubal. This step was followed up by a seizure of all the Jesuits at Court (September, 1757), and the publication of a manifesto against them which created a great sensation in Europe. The principal charge alleged against them in this document was their conduct with regard to the Indians of Paraguay. In the following year Pombal denounced them to Pope Benedict XIV. as violating the laws of their Society by illicit traffic and plots against the Government; he forbade them to engage in commerce, and finally even to preach and confess. The answer of the Papal See to this application was deferred by the death of Benedict (May, 1758); but, soon after, the attempt on the life of King Joseph, already related, afforded Pombal a pretext to root out the Society.[1] They were accused of being privy to that attempt; the new Pope, Clement XIII., was applied to for a brief authorizing their degradation and punishment; and on the

[1] Joseph I. of Portugal died in February, 1777, and was succeeded by his daughter, Maria Francisca. Pombal had endeavoured to set her aside by abolishing the decrees of the Cortes, which established the female succession, and transferring the Crown to Joseph, grandson of the reigning monarch, who gave his consent to the arrangement. But Charles III. of Spain announced his resolution of supporting his niece's rights with his whole force, and the design against her was abandoned. On the accession of Maria Francisca, Pombal was dismissed Coxe, *Span. Bourbons*, ch. lxix.

Pope's hesitating, Pombal caused all the Jesuits in Portugal, to the number of 600, to be seized and thrown on the Italian coast at Cività Vecchia (September, 1759). Clement, in retaliation, ordered Pompal's manifesto to be publicly burnt; to which that Minister replied by confiscating all the possessions of the Society, and breaking off diplomatic relations with Rome. Pombal, who was no philosophic reformer, and was not averse even to an *auto de fé* which might increase his popularity, proceeded against the unfortunate Malagrida by ecclesiastical methods. Instead of arraigning him for high treason, he caused him to be declared a heretic by the Inquisition, which was conducted by Dominicans. He was then delivered to the secular arm and burnt September 20th, 1761.

Considering the light in which the Jesuits were generally regarded, Pombal's act did not meet so much approval from the public opinion of Europe as might have been anticipated. The hypocrisy of the proceedings against them was revolting to the philosophical spirit of the age, while their illegality and cruelty excited disgust in England and other Protestant countries. Nevertheless a strong feeling of dissatisfaction with the Society prevailed throughout the greater part of Europe, which the example of Portugal served to stimulate to action. France was the first nation to imitate it. The Jesuits, generally so accommodating to the manners of the age, had been imprudent enough to display their hostility towards Madame de Pompadour, and, by a strange coalition, the Royal mistress combined with the Jansenists of the Parliament for their destruction. Their commercial transactions in the French colonies afforded a handle against them. Their house at Martinico, governed by La Valette, had been converted into a great commercial and banking establishment. Their consignments having been intercepted by the English, the merchants who had accepted their bills became insolvent, and the creditors then proceeded against La Valette, who declared himself bankrupt. The creditors hereupon brought an action at Marseilles against the whole Society established in France, and obtained a verdict (May, 1760), which was confirmed on appeal by the Parliament of Paris.

The scandal of this affair caused a great sensation in Europe. The Genoese Government ordered the Jesuits to close their commercial establishment in that city. Venice forbade them to receive any more novices. In France, their trade, principally in drugs, was suspended, and their affairs, as well as the constitu-

tions of their Society, were submitted, in spite of the intervention of Pope Clement XIII., to the examination of the various Parliaments. That of Paris severely denounced their doctrines as murderous and abominable, condemned a multitude of their books, and forbade them any longer to teach. Louis XV., who, from fear, it is said, of a Jesuit knife, was not so inimical as his mistress to them, endeavoured to effect a compromise, and, by the advice of some of his chief prelates, proposed to them to modify their institutions. But to permit these to be regulated by a civil power would have been a kind of suicide. Their General, Ricci, at once rejected the proposal, and declared that they must remain as they were, or cease to exist.[1] Clement XIII. in vain endeavoured to rouse the fanaticism of France in their favour. Choiseul and Pompadour triumphed over all opposition, though the Queen and the Dauphin were ranged on the other side. But the Minister prudently left the odium and responsibility of the proceedings against the Jesuits to the Parliament, who, in the winter of 1761, issued against them several celebrated *comptes rendus*. The Parliament of Rouen took the lead in these proceedings by a decree annulling the statutes of the Society, condemning them to be burnt, and directing all the Jesuits in their jurisdiction to evacuate their houses and colleges (February, 1762). The Parliament of Paris followed this example in April, and similar measures were adopted by those of Bordeaux, Rennes, Metz, Pau, Perpignan, Toulouse, and Aix. Some of these Courts, however, as those of Dijon and Grenoble, did not go to such lengths, while others, as those of Besançon and Douai, were altogether favourable to the Society. The Parliament of Paris, in a decree of August 6th, charged the Jesuits with systematically justifying crimes and vices of all sorts; brought against them the political charge of owing their allegiance to a foreign Sovereign, thus forming a State within the State; and finished with pronouncing them irrevocably excluded from the Kingdom.[2] But though this decree was published in the King's name, it did not bear his signature; and it was not till November, 1764, that the Society was entirely suppressed in France by Royal authority.

Choiseul's enmity against the Jesuits was not satisfied with their expulsion from France. He resolved to effect their entire destruction, and especially he contributed to their banishment from Spain; where he is said not to have scrupled at circulating forged letters

[1] "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint."—*Flassan*, t. vi. p. 500.
[2] *Anc. Lois Françaises*, t. xxii. p. 328.

in the names of their generals and chiefs, with the design of bringing them into hatred and suspicion.[1] Several of the Spanish Ministers of that day, Aranda, Campomanes, Monino (afterwards better known as Florida Blanca), were imbued with the spirit of the French philosophy, and were disposed to follow the example of Choiseul; but Charles III. hesitated long before he adopted any violent measures against the Society. Some occurrences, however, which took place in 1765 and the following year, excited his suspicions against them. They were accused of being the authors of the disturbances which arose in the Spanish colonies in America on the occasion of a new code of taxes, as well as of the tumults at Madrid in the spring of 1766. These riots, however, were really caused by the conduct of the Marquis Squillaci, Minister of Finance and War. Squillaci had introduced a better system of police at Madrid; but being himself an Italian, he had paid little attention, in prosecuting his reforms, to the national customs and prejudices; nor were these much more respected by the King, who, though born in Spain, had quitted it too early to retain much love for its manners. Squillaci had also incurred the hatred of the people by establishing a monopoly for supplying Madrid with oil, bread, and other necessaries. But his interference with the national costume was the immediate cause of the insurrection. The huge mantles and hats with flaps that could be let down had been found, by the concealment which they afforded to the person, to favour the commission of murders, robberies, and other crimes, and Squillaci therefore published an edict forbidding them to be worn. Its appearance was the signal for an uproar. The populace surrounded the Royal Palace; loud cries arose for the head of Squillaci; nor could the tumult be appeased till the King appeared on his balcony, promised to dismiss the obnoxious Minister, and to appoint a Spaniard in his stead. Instead of doing so, however, Charles fled to Aranjuez in the night with Squillaci. But the tumult was renewed, the King was again forced to capitulate, and to perform his promise of dismissing the Minister. Charles attributed these affronts to a conspiracy of the Jesuits with a view to drive him into a retrograde policy. They were also charged with a design to exterminate the King and all his family, of which, however, there appears to be no proof. The Society was suppressed in Spain by a Royal Decree, April 2nd, 1766, and all the members of it were banished the Kingdom. It was further ordered that the Jesuits

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. iv. p. 354.

in all the Spanish possessions throughout the world should be arrested on the same day and hour, carried to the nearest port, and shipped off to the Roman States, as being the subjects of the Pope rather than of the King. Clement XIII., at the instigation of Ricci, declared that he would not receive them. The Spanish vessels which arrived at Cività Vecchia were fired upon; they were repulsed at all the ports on the Italian coast; and the miserable exiles with whom they were filled, after enduring terrible hardships, were at length indebted to Charles III. for procuring them an asylum in Corsica. The Court of Rome ultimately relaxed in its severity, and received the Jesuits despatched from the East Indies and America; to each of whom the King of Spain allowed a small pittance of two pauls, or about a shilling a day.[1]

The decree of Charles III. was followed by another blow against the Jesuits in France. The measures taken against them in that country had not been rigorously carried out. They had found support in the differences of opinion respecting them which prevailed in the various parliaments, as well as the quarrels of those bodies with the Court, and they had still retained influence enough to cause fear and embarrassment to their opponents. But when the news of the proceedings against them in Spain arrived in France, the Parliament of Paris was encouraged to declare them public enemies, to command them to quit the Kingdom in a fortnight, and to supplicate the King, in conjunction with all Catholic Princes, to obtain from the Pope the entire suppression of the Society (May 9th, 1767). Choiseul, in conjunction with Pombal, urged the King of Spain to support them in his undertaking; but though Charles had acted so rigorously against the Jesuits in his own dominions, he could not at first persuade himself to aid in their entire destruction. While he was thus hesitating, the Pontiff, by an imprudent provocation, determined him to assist the views of the French and Portuguese Ministers. The Bourbon Sovereigns in Italy, the King of Naples, and the Duke of Parma, had followed the example of Spain, and expelled the Jesuits. Clement XIII. was impolitic enough to show his displeasure by attacking the weakest of these Sovereigns. He excommunicated the Duke of Parma, and declared him deprived of his principality as a rebellious vassal of the Church (January 20th, 1768). To avenge this insult to the House of

[1] Respecting the Spanish Jesuits, see Viardot, *Les Jésuites jugés par les rois, les peuples, et le pape*, 1857.

Bourbon, Charles III. urged the Kings of France and Naples to take vigorous steps against the Pope. Louis XV. responded to his appeal by seizing Avignon and the Venaissin, whilst the Neapolitans invaded Benevento. The movement against the Jesuits spread throughout Catholic Europe. They were expelled from Venice, Modena, and even from Bavaria, the focus of German Jesuitism. The pious scruples of Maria Theresa deterred her at present from proceeding to such extremities; although her son Joseph II., and her Minister Kaunitz, disciples of the French philosophy, would willingly have seen them adopted; but the Jesuits were deposed from the chairs of theology and philosophy in the Austrian dominions. At length an alarming proof of the influence still retained by them in Spain induced Charles III. to co-operate vigorously for their suppression. On St. Charles's day, when he showed himself on his balcony, the people having raised a unanimous cry for their recall, the Spanish Ambassador at Rome was instructed, in conjunction with those of France and Naples, to require from the Pope the abolition of the Society (January, 1769). This demand proved a death-blow to the aged Clement XIII., who died on the very eve of the day when the question was to come before the Consistory (February 3rd). The Jesuits moved heaven and earth to procure the election of a Pope favourable to their cause; but they missed their aim by two votes. The choice of the conclave fell on Ganganelli, a minor conventual, whose opinion on the subject was unknown. Ganganelli, who assumed the title of Clement XIV., was of quite a different character from his mediocre, rigid, and obstinate predecessor. He possessed considerable abilities, was enlightened and tolerant, and bore some resemblance to Benedict XIV., but had less vivacity and gentler manners. The Jesuit question was a terrible embarrassment to him. On one side he found himself menaced by the Bourbon Sovereigns; on the other, the obscure threats of the Jesuits filled him with the apprehension of poison. To conciliate the former, he revoked the Brief against the Duke of Parma, suppressed the famous bull *In Cœna Domini*, and even wrote to the King of Spain (April, 1770), promising to abolish the Jesuits. That Society struggled with all the tenacity of despair, and scrupled not to invoke the aid even of heretical Powers, as England, the Czarina, and Frederick II. The fall of Choiseul filled them with hope; but Charles III. was now become even more implacable than he, and appealed to the Family Compact to urge on the French King. The last support of the

Jesuits gave way when Maria Theresa, at the instance of her son Joseph, at last consented to their abolition. Clement XIV. now found himself compelled to defer to the wishes of the allied Courts. On July 21st, 1773, he issued the bull *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, for the suppression of the Society, in which he acknowledged that they had disturbed the Christian Commonwealth, and proclaimed the necessity for their disappearance. The houses of the Society still remaining were now shut up, and their General Ricci was imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo, where he died two years after. It was in Protestant countries alone that the Jesuits found any sympathy and defence. Frederick the Great especially, who considered their system of education to be useful, forbade the bull against them to be published in his dominions. But the Jesuits were destined to revive. Clement XIV. was rewarded for his compliance by the restoration of Avignon and the Venaissin, which, however, the Revolution was soon to reunite to France. On the other hand, this measure is thought to have cost him his life. In the Holy Week of 1774 he was suddenly seized with symptoms which appeared to indicate poison; and though he survived till September 22nd, he was subject to constant torments. All Rome ascribed his death to the *aqua tofana;* and such also was the opinion of Cardinal Bernis, the French Ambassador at Rome, as well as of Pius VI., Clement's successor.[1] The Spanish and Neapolitan Ministers, on the other hand, attributed his malady to fear.[2] But to return to the affairs of France.

After the dismissal of Choiseul, the government of that country was conducted by a sort of triumvirate, composed of the Chancellor Maupeou, the Abbé Terrai, who administered the finances, and the Duke d'Aiguillon, who was appointed Secretary for Foreign Affairs in June, 1771; while over all the infamous Du Barri reigned supreme. Nothing of importance occurred in the external relations of France during the remainder of Louis XV.'s reign. The only event of European interest was the partition of Poland, which country, as we have seen, D'Aiguillon abandoned to its fate. Meanwhile domestic maladministration was producing those evils and exciting those class-hatreds, which, though kept down for a time, exploded so fearfully in the Revolution.

[1] See Bernis's *Despatches*, September 5th and October 26th, 1774, and October 28th, 1777, ap. Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 222 note.

[2] On the fall of the Jesuits, see St. Priest, *Suppression de la Société de Jésus;* Theiner, *Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens XIV.;* Abbé Georges, *Mém. pour servir à l'Histoire des évènemens de la fin du xviiième siècle.*

The finances were every day growing worse and worse. Terrai, to avert a total bankruptcy, resorted to a partial one by cheating the public creditors, plundering annuitants, and arbitrarily reducing the interest on Government debts. These measures, indeed, touched only the richer classes of society, but the arbitrary taxes which he imposed were felt by the people at large. The wide-spread misery and discontent were aggravated by dearth. Several bad harvests had succeeded one another; the scarcity became intolerable, although the exportation of corn had been prohibited, and frequent riots took place in the provinces. In this state of things the public hatred found an object in the King himself. The Parliament of Rouen openly charged Louis XV. with being a forestaller, nor could he satisfactorily refute the imputation. About the year 1767 a company had been established under the control of Government called the *Société Malisset*, with the professed object of keeping the price of corn at a certain level, and insuring a supply for Paris by buying up and storing grain in plentiful years in order to resell it in times of scarcity. The design, perhaps, may have been good; but a measure so easy of abuse and so liable to suspicion, was in the highest degree dangerous. Profligate, expensive, and avaricious, Louis XV. scrupled not to avail himself of the advantages of his situation to fill his private treasury at the expense of his subjects. He was accustomed to speculate in all kinds of securities, and when an Edict was in preparation by the Council which might depreciate the value of any of these, he withheld his signature till he had realized! In like manner he converted the *Société Malisset* into an instrument of private gain. Through the agency of Terrai, who bought up corn at low prices in Languedoc, where exportation had been prohibited, large quantities were sent to Jersey, through the ports of Brittany, which had been opened, in order to be reimported into France after prices should have been raised to a *maximum* by artificial methods. The King's participation in these nefarious transactions was notorious. The prices of grain throughout the Kingdom lay constantly on his writing table; nay, among the officers of finance, the name of a "Treasurer of grain on account of His Majesty" was inadvertently suffered to appear in the Royal Almanack for 1774. The Court endeavoured to divert the popular odium by accusing the Parliaments of causing the scarcity; the Parliaments retorted the charge on the Ministers; the people regarded them all as equally guilty, and ended by considering the upper classes as so many vampires leagued to

suck their blood. The *Société Malisset* obtained the name of the *Pacte de Famine*, under which it was destined to appear at the breaking out of the Revolution.[1]

The notoriously depraved and licentious character of the King, combined with this baseness, caused him to be contemned as well as hated. Already in his lifetime the people bestowed on his heir the title of *Louis le Désiré*, so low had Louis, once the *bien Aimé*, fallen in the popular estimation. The universal wish for his death was gratified May 10th, 1774. It was caused by the small-pox, caught from a scarcely marriageable girl, one of the victims of his lust; which, falling on a man of sixty-four with a constitution already contaminated by vice, proved fatal. He had reigned fifty-nine years, during which he had contrived totally to destroy the prestige of Royalty, created by the brilliant reigns of Henry IV. and Louis XIV.

He was succeeded by his grandson, Louis XVI., whose father the Dauphin had died in 1765. The new Monarch, as we have said, had married, in May, 1770, the Austrian Archduchess, Marie Antoinette, daughter of Maria Theresa. He was now in his twentieth year, and his character was yet undeveloped. It seemed to promise both good sense and good principles, unrecommended, however, by grace and dignity of manner, and accompanied with want of energy and resolution which ultimately proved the chief cause of his ruin. He was fond of books, and still more of the natural sciences and mechanical arts. His first act was to send Madame du Barri to a convent; but, with his usual indecision, this severity was not sustained, and she was permitted to retire to her estate near Marli. The fall of the mistress was soon followed by that of the Ministers who had supported her. Maupeou, D'Aiguillon, and Terrai were succeeded by Maurepas, Vergennes, and Turgot. The last, who had distinguished himself as a political economist, after filling the office of Minister of Marine, was placed at the head of the finances.

Soon after his accession, Louis XVI., by the advice of Maurepas, re-established the Parliaments—one of the greatest mistakes, perhaps, of his reign. Turgot had opposed this measure. Louis's address to the Parliament of Paris was, however, very despotic, and he made several alterations in its constitution, especially by the suppression of the two chambers of requests.

[1] The Provost de Beaumont, who had denounced the *Société Malisset* to the Parliament of Rouen, suddenly disappeared. On the celebrated 14th of July, 1790, he was discovered in a dungeon. Martin, t. xvi. p. 293 sq.: *Vie privée de Louis XV.* t. iv. p. 152.

By the dismissal of Turgot, in May, 1776, through the intrigues of Maurepas and other enemies, the Monarchy lost its last chance; he was, perhaps, the only man in France who, by means of reform, might have averted revolution. His fall is said to have been accomplished by means of a letter, in which his hand was forged, containing sarcasms upon the Queen and Maurepas, and even expressions calculated to wound the King.[1] Turgot was succeeded as controller of the finances by M. de Clugni, and, after his death, by Taboureau de Réaux. The latter was an insignificant person, and the finances were really managed by Necker, a Genevese banker, under a new title of Director of the Royal Treasury. In the following year, on the resignation of Taboureau, Necker was made Director-General of the Finances, but without a seat in the Council, on the ground of his religion. Nevertheless, France and Europe called it the Necker Administration. Necker was a good practical man of business, and introduced many useful reforms; but he possessed not the broad and daring grasp of mind and the statesmanlike views which characterized Turgot.

The state of the revenue compelled France, at this period, to play but a minor part in the general affairs of Europe, and the reign of Louis XVI. might probably have been passed in profound tranquillity, had not the quarrel of Great Britain with her North-American colonies offered an opportunity, too tempting to be resisted, to gratify the national hatred and revenge. The history of that quarrel belongs to the domestic annals of England, and is connected with European history only by its results, and the maritime war to which it gave rise. Its details must be familiar to most of our readers, and we need, therefore, only briefly recapitulate some of its leading events:—the Stamp Act of 1765, attempted to be thrust on the Americans by the mother-country, and resisted by them on the ground that they were not represented in the British Parliament; its withdrawal in the following year, accompanied, however, with an offensive declaration of the supreme rights of the mother-country over her colonies; the renewed attempt, in 1767, to raise duties in America, on tea, paper, painters' colours, and glass; the abandonment of these by Lord North, except the duty on tea, in 1770; the permission given to the East India Company, in 1773, to export their surplus stock to America, and the destruction of some of these cargoes in Boston Harbour. The quarrel was now becoming serious and

[1] See *Œuvres de Turgot, Notice Hist.* par M. Daire, t. i. p. cxi.

complicated. In the spring of 1774, Acts were passed by the British Parliament for suppressing the Port of Boston, for abolishing the charter and democratic government of Massachusetts, and for authorizing the governors of colonies to send home persons guilty of rebellion, to be tried by the Court of King's Bench. General Gage was sent to Boston to enforce these measures; but the troops at his disposal were not adequate to support such rigorous proceedings. The colonists agreed to abstain from using British merchandise till Massachusetts should be restored to its privileges; while a General Congress, which met at Philadelphia, in December, 1774, resolved to repel force by force. They drew up addresses to the people of Great Britain, as well as to the Colonies; and a petition to the King, in which they professed, or pretended to profess, their loyalty. But, in spite of Lord Chatham's eloquent warnings, the Government persisted in its course. In February, 1775, bills were brought in to restrain the commerce of the New England provinces, and to exclude them from the Newfoundland fishery. These measures were shortly followed by a collision. General Gage, who had received reinforcements, having dispersed some American militia at Lexington, April 19th, 1775, the colonists assembled on all sides, and drove the English back to the suburbs of Boston. The Congress now appointed George Washington commander-in-chief; and on the 4th of July they published a Declaration explaining their motives, but denying any intention to separate from the mother-country. Washington, with 20,000 men, now blockaded Boston. In an attempt to relieve themselves, the English, under Generals Howe and Burgoyne, fought the Battle of Bunker's Hill, July 17th, when, but with considerable loss, they ultimately defeated the Americans under Putnam. The blockade of Boston, however, still continued, and in March, 1776, Howe was compelled to abandon that town, and to retire to Halifax in Nova Scotia. The Americans, elated with their success, made an attempt upon Canada, but were repulsed.

The English Ministry had felt the necessity for making more vigorous efforts, and, early in 1776, treaties had been concluded with some German Princes, the Duke of Brunswick, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, his son, the Count of Hanau, and the Prince of Waldeck, by which they engaged to supply between 17,000 and 18,000 men to serve against the Americans. The country had to pay dearly for the degradation of incorporating these foreign hirelings in her armies. Much deeper, however, was the shame of the

Princes who engaged in this white slave trade, and sold the blood of their subjects to fill their own coffers, and support their pomp and luxury. The Duke of Brunswick alone appears to have applied the wages of blood to the benefit of his remaining subjects. These proceedings afforded the Americans a motive, or at all events a pretext, for taking the last step, and altogether renouncing their connection with the mother-country, in order that they might be able to hire foreign mercenaries themselves. Public opinion in America had been stimulated in this direction by many publications and addresses, and especially by Thomas Paine's celebrated pamphlet entitled *Common Sense*. On July 4th, 1776, Congress, under the Presidency of John Hancock, made its DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCY; and, in the following October, thirteen States[1] confederated themselves together at Philadelphia, under the title of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The German contingents had raised the British army in America to 55,000 men, and the campaign of 1776 proved very unfavourable to the Americans. From desertion and other causes, Washington at one period found his army reduced to 3,000 men. But he retrieved his fortunes in a winter campaign, in which, being aided by reinforcements under General Lee, he reconquered the greater part of Jersey, and drove the English back to Brunswick. The American declaration of Independency encouraged France to afford more active, though still underhand, assistance to the nascent Republic. Already before that event, Silas Deane had been despatched to France, where, under the guise of a merchant he intrigued with the Government, and endeavoured to obtain supplies of arms and money. His negotiations were carried on through Baron de Beaumarchais, now best known as a lively and successful dramatist, but who himself regarded literature as very subordinate to his commercial and political pursuits. Louis XVI was averse to a war with England, and in this view he was supported by Maurepas and Necker. Marie Antoinette, on the other hand, led away perhaps by an unreflecting enthusiasm, was ardent in the cause of American liberty, and this feeling was shared by what was called the Austrian party. Vergennes, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, inclined the same way, but from different motives; a bitter hatred of England, and a desire of overthrowing the peace of 1763, which he regarded as ignominious, and detri-

[1] New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

mental to French interests. This party prevailed. The French Ministry secretly encouraged the Americans, flattered their military ardour, and gave circulation to the writings of their partisans, while, at the same time, the French Ambassador in London was instructed frequently to assure that Court of the strictest neutrality on the part of France! The French Government did not merely connive at the Americans being furnished with supplies and munitions; it gave them active assistance. Beaumarchais was provided with a million livres to found a commercial house for supplying the Americans with the materials of war, and the public arsenals were placed at his disposal for the purchasing of warlike stores. On the recommendation of the Court of Versailles, Beaumarchais obtained a second million from Spain. Other commercial houses were also assisted with money by the Government, and from these Silas Deane procured all that he wanted. Aids in money were also directly forwarded to the Congress through private channels.[1] Privateers, fitted out in France, but sailing under American colours, committed great depredations on the English trade. Towards the end of 1776, the arrival of Dr. Franklin and Dr. Lee, in Paris, as envoys from the American Congress, excited great enthusiasm. These representatives of the New World, by the simplicity of their dress and manners, attracted the attention and homage of a frivolous people, which fancied that it had grown philosophical. To many of the *têtes exaltées* of the times, the opportunity of striking a blow at once in the cause of liberty and against England was irresistible. Among the most distinguished Frenchmen who offered their swords to the Americans, may be named La Fayette, the Viscount de Noailles, and the Count de Ségur.

It was not, however, till 1778 that France formally recognized American independence. The American campaign of that year had at first gone in favour of the English. Howe had defeated Washington at Brandywine September 11th, had subsequently taken Philadelphia (26th), and again repulsed Washington at Germantown, October 24th. But these successes were more than counterbalanced by the fate of General Burgoyne. That commander, advancing from Canada by Lake Champlain, was surrounded by the enemy at Saratoga; where, not having received the support which he expected from General Howe and

[1] Flassan, t. vii. p. 149 (Letter of Vergennes to the King, May 2nd, 1776): cf. Loménie, *Beaumarchais, sa vie, ses écrits, et son temps.*

Sir H. Clinton, he was compelled to surrender with his whole remaining force to the American General Gates (October 16th).

The capitulation of Saratoga formed a crisis in the American war. France, which had been gradually increasing her navy and preparing for events, was induced by this disaster of the British arms to side openly with the revolted colonists. She entered into a treaty of friendship and commerce with them, February 6th, 1778, and on the same day was concluded between them an eventual defensive and offensive treaty, to take effect in case Great Britain should break the peace with France; an event which France was at all events determined to bring about, and which must have been foreseen as a certain consequence of the recognition of American independence. She promised pecuniary aid, and both parties agreed not to lay down their arms, nor to conclude a separate truce or peace with Great Britain, till she should have recognized the United States.[1] Long after these treaties had been arranged, both Maurepas and De Vergennes, the latter *upon his honour*, denied all knowledge of them when questioned by Lord Stormont, the British Ambassador.[2] On March 13th. the French Ambassador at London announced with offensive *brusquerie* the measures taken by his Court. He declared that Louis XVI., having resolved to uphold the commercial liberties of his subjects, and to maintain the honour of the French flag, had taken for this purpose eventual measures with the United States.[3] Such an announcement so delivered could only be regarded as a declaration of war, and accordingly the English Ambassador was recalled from Paris.

Louis XVI. had thus struck a blow, which, it can hardly be doubted, contributed to his appearance on the scaffold. The financial embarrassments of France were augmented by the expenses of the war, and the maxim, new in France, was sanctioned by the Sovereign himself, that a people who consider themselves oppressed are at liberty to rebel. A school was opened to young Frenchmen who brought back with them from America a spirit of innovation and a resolution to carry this maxim into execution in their own country.[4]

[1] Martens, t. ii p. 701. It is called a *defensive alliance*, but some of the articles stipulate respecting a contemplated attack by France on British Possessions.

[2] Adolphus, *Reign of George III.* vol. ii. p. 537 sq.

[3] Flassan, t. vii. p. 167.

[4] Thus, when La Fayette read at Washington's head-quarters, in the French notification to England that the United States were recognized as being "en possession de l'indépendance par leur Acte de tel jour," he exclaimed: "Voilà une grande vérité que nous leur rappellerons un jour chez eux!" *Mémoires* de La Fayette, ap. Martin, t. xvi. p. 426.

Menaced by a war with France, Great Britain had offered Congress the most liberal terms of accommodation provided the Declaration of Independence should be withdrawn. But it was now too late; the proposals were answered by the Americans with insulting virulence, and denounced as contrived only to make them languid in pursuing the war.

Finding a war with France inevitable, George III., in a message to Parliament, declared that the peace of Europe had been disturbed against his will, that he could hardly be reproached for his feelings against so unjust and so unprovoked an aggression on the honour of his Crown and the interests of his Kingdom, contrary to the most solemn assurances, in violation of the laws of nations, and injurious to the rights of all the Sovereign Powers of Europe.

The war, which had not been formally declared, was begun by an affair off Ushant, June 17th, between Keppel's fleet and two French frigates, one of which was captured. On July 27th an indecisive engagement took place in the same neighbourhood between the fleets of Keppel and D'Orvilliers. The Duke of Chartres, afterwards the noted Duke of Orleans, was on board the latter; and some imputations on his courage during the action, attributed to Queen Marie Antoinette, caused him to conceive against her an implacable hatred.

A French fleet, under the Count d'Estaing, had been despatched to surprise Admiral Howe in the Delaware. D'Estaing, however, was three months in sailing to America, and the English division occupying Philadelphia had time to escape to New York. An engagement between Howe and D'Estaing was prevented by a storm. An English fleet, under Admiral Byron, which had been despatched in quest of D'Estaing, compelled him to abandon an enterprise against Rhode Island which he had concerted with the Americans, and to retire to Boston, where he was blockaded by Byron; but in November he succeeded in escaping to the Antilles. Other operations this year were the taking, by the English, of St. Lucie, and of St. Pierre and Miquelon, two small islands off Newfoundland, and the capture of Dominica by the French. The land campaign terminated on the whole in favour of the English, Colonel Campbell, towards the close of the year, having reduced the greater part of Georgia.

The war had also extended to the East Indies. In that country, as in America, the French had secretly assisted the enemies of the British Crown, and especially Hyder Ally, the formidable

Sovereign of Mysore; who had been disgusted with the refusal of the English to grant him the aid against the Mahrattas to which he thought himself entitled by a treaty concluded with them in 1769. But the efforts of the French were not so successful in these regions as in the other hemisphere. As soon as the certainty of a war with France was known in India, the Government of Calcutta suddenly attacked the possessions still retained by France in India. Chandernagor and the factories at Masulipatam and Karical surrendered without a blow. A military force, supported by a naval squadron, was then directed against Pondicherry, which surrendered after a siege of seventy days (October, 1778). Fort Mahé was captured in the following March, and the French flag disappeared, for a while, from the Indian continent.

The year 1779 added Spain to the list of Powers arrayed against England. That country had long displayed a hostile feeling against England, and the Spanish Minister, Florida Blanca, had been endeavouring to raise up enemies against her by his intrigues and negotiations with Hyder Ally, the King of Prussia, the Empress of Russia, and even the Emperor of Morocco, whose aid might be of service in an attempt to recapture Gibraltar. Charles III., however, when summoned by the Court of Versailles to afford his aid in conformity with the Family Compact, at first pretended a desire to restore tranquillity, although he had already determined on a war, and was making preparations for it, which were to be completed under this veil. He offered his mediation, proposing terms which were wholly inadmissible by the British Government, although they met the views of France and the American Envoys; and when they were declined, he declared war against Great Britain, June 16th, 1779. The declaration was accompanied with a long, laboured manifesto, one of the most singular compositions in the annals of diplomacy for the minuteness with which the most trifling grievances were enumerated, and the pomp and vehemence with which they were denounced.[1] France, also, after a year's war, now first published a manifesto in justification of her views and conduct, which was answered by the historian Gibbon.

The union of France and Spain threatened England with dangers such as she had not experienced since the days of the

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. v. p. 42. See also for these negotiations, Dohm, *Materialien für die Statistick*, Lieferung, iii. and iv.; Adolphus, *Reign of George III.* ch. xxxv.

Armada. The combined fleets, when united in July, formed a total of sixty-eight ships of the line, besides frigates and smaller vessels. On the coasts of Brittany and Normandy a host of 60,000 men had been assembled for a descent upon England, and 300 transports had been prepared for their conveyance. The precautions taken in England against this threatened invasion, and the efforts made to raise a military force, served to increase the panic. Many of the inhabitants of the south coast sought refuge in the interior of the kingdom. The English Government, lulled into a false security by the professions of Spain, and by the idea that a war was quite opposed to her interests, had neglected to take the necessary precautions; and an appeal to Holland to furnish the succours stipulated by treaty had proved unavailing. The fleet which mustered under the flag of Admiral Hardy numbered only thirty-eight ships of the line, and was therefore compelled to remain on the defensive. The combined French and Spanish fleets appeared three consecutive days before Plymouth, and chased Hardy towards the Wight. An action was momentarily expected, when the French and Spanish commanders suddenly retired to their ports. The only mischief they had effected was the taking of a sixty-four gun ship. This mortifying failure occasioned for a time a serious misunderstanding between the Bourbon Courts. Florida Blanca induced Charles III. to make a clandestine proposition to the English Cabinet for a peace, on condition of the surrender of Gibraltar; but, though the English Government seemed inclined to listen to the offer, the negotiations came to nothing, and were probably only intended by Spain to stimulate France to more vigorous action. The Spaniards, however, had much at heart the recovery of that fortress. They had laid siege to it immediately after the rupture with England; but Rodney managed to revictual it, and reinforce the garrison by landing a regiment. On his way he had captured a convoy of fifteen sail, with a sixty-four gun ship, and four frigates, carrying naval stores and provisions to Cadiz, which thus contributed to the supply of Gibraltar. In the following January he defeated, off Cape St. Vincent, the Spanish blockading squadron under Admiral Langara, after a severe engagement of eight hours, during a dark and tempestuous night. Rodney, after relieving Gibraltar, sailed for the West Indies. The Spaniards had soon after some revenge, by surprising and capturing, off the Azores, a British West Indian fleet. Near sixty vessels were carried into Cadiz, with property estimated at two millions sterling.

The chief incident of the war in America, during the year 1779, was the capture of St. Vincent and Grenada by D'Estaing. An indecisive action took place between him and Admiral Byron, July 6th. Towards the autumn, D'Estaing made an attempt to reconquer Georgia, and, in conjunction with the American general, Lincoln, he attacked Savannah, October 9th, but was repulsed with great loss. In Africa, the English took the Isle of Goree from the French. The campaign of 1780 was also marked with varying success. General Clinton undertook from New York an expedition into South Carolina, and captured Charlestown, May 12th; but by Clinton's departure, Rhode Island was left exposed, and, in July, the French established themselves in it. Lord Cornwallis, whom Clinton had appointed commandant at Charlestown, defeated the American general, Gates, who was endeavouring to surround him with superior forces, at Camden, August 16th. In the South, the Spaniards took most of the English forts on the Mississippi. At sea, Rodney fought three indecisive actions with Count de Guichen off Martinico. During this year, the formation of the league called the ARMED NEUTRALITY, and the rupture between Great Britain and Holland, seemed to array against the former Power nearly the whole of Europe. To explain this league, we must premise a few brief remarks on the state of maritime law.

From the earliest periods of maritime commerce the attention of European jurists had been directed to the question of the rights of neutrals during war. One of the oldest Maritime Codes, the *Consolato del Mare*,[1] established the principles "that neutral merchandise carried by an enemy is free; but that the neutral flag does not neutralize an enemy's merchandise."[2] These principles were subsequently restricted; the former was rejected, the latter retained. Francis I. of France, by an Edict in 1543, rendered maritime law still less liberal, by declaring that the goods of an enemy found in a neutral vessel, entailed the confiscation of the rest of the cargo, and even of the ship. This continued to be the general maritime law, especially in France, though with some particular exceptions, down to about the middle of the seventeenth century, when greater privileges were accorded to the neutral flag. The reverse of the principle laid down by the *Consolato del Mare* had, about the period named, been pretty generally established; namely, that in all instances goods follow the flag; so that neutral goods on board an enemy's vessel might be confiscated; whilst the neutral flag rendered an enemy's merchandise sacred,

[1] See Vol. II. p. 147.

[2] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 15 sq.

always excepting contraband of war. This principle it was that enabled the Dutch to become the carriers of Europe. It had been recognized in several treaties by the States-General, France, Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal, between the years 1642 and 1674; but Denmark and Sweden adhered to the old system. Louis XIV., however, finding himself in possession of an enormous fleet, and considering himself master of the seas, issued in 1681, in contempt of treaties, the famous Ordinance, which condemned all ships laden with an enemy's goods, as well as the goods of his own subjects and allies found in an enemy's vessel; or, in other words, he ordained that the neutral flag does not cover the goods, and, on the other hand, that the enemy's flag condemns neutral merchandise. In the war of the Spanish Succession, the French Government became still more illiberal, and established the maxim that the quality of the merchandise seized does not depend on the quality of the owner; but that every production of the soil or manufacture of an enemy, whoever the proprietor might be, was liable to confiscation.

Great Britain restrained these excesses by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, by proclaiming the principle that the neutral flag covers an enemy's goods; though it was tacitly recognized that neutral merchandise in an enemy's vessel was not exempt from seizure. France subsequently repudiated this principle in various treaties; and Louis XV., by an ordinance of October 21st, 1744, declared as lawful prize not only an enemy's goods on board a neutral vessel, but, in general, all productions of an enemy's soil or manufacture, by whomsoever owned; with exceptions, however, in favour of the Dutch and Danish flags. Even so late as 1779, when the war with Great Britain had commenced, France had not yet recognized the principle that the flag covers the goods. An ordinance of July 26th, 1778, confirms that of 1681, in all particulars not altered by the later one; and as in this nothing is said about the principle in question, it must, of course, be regarded as recognizing the ancient theory. Nay, this theory was acted upon in a treaty concluded between France and the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, September 18th, 1779.[1] It was not till 1780 that France, veering with her interests, suddenly changed her tone, and subscribed to the principles adopted by the Armed Neutrality.[2]

[1] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 26.

[2] It will be seen from this statement, which is taken from the impartial work of M. le Comte de Garden, that the French, till they found the contrary to be their interest, were the most illiberal and tyrannical of all the maritime Powers. Yet M. Martin, in his account of the Armed Neutrality, with a want of candour unworthy of an historian, suppresses these

This famous League was caused as follows. The North of Europe abounds with materials, such as timber, hemp, pitch, &c., for the construction and equipment of ships. When the war between Great Britain and the Bourbon Courts broke out, the English cruisers intercepted neutral vessels conveying such materials to French and Spanish ports, on the ground that they were contraband of war. To prevent this practice was one of the motives of Catharine II. for forming the Armed Neutrality; a measure which has been considered as redounding to her glory, yet which was, in fact, effected, almost against her will, by a ministerial intrigue. A struggle was going on between England and the Powers inimical to her to obtain the friendship and support of the Czarina. Catharine herself was disposed toward England, and these sentiments were shared by Prince Potemkin. The British Cabinet, to lure Catharine, had offered to cede to her Minorca; and Potemkin, in return for the exertion of his influence, was to have two millions sterling, the computed value of the stores and artillery.[1] On the other hand, Potemkin was enticed by Prussia and France with the prospect of Courland and the Polish Crown. Catharine's minister, Count Panin, was, however, adverse to Great Britain, and a warm supporter of Frederick II., who, at that time, entertained a bitter animosity against George III. and the English nation. Florida Blanca, according to the apology for his administration, published by that Minister, by his intrigues and negotiations with Count Panin, was the chief instrument in bringing about the Armed Neutrality. Orders were issued directing the Spanish cruisers to imitate the example of England in overhauling neutral vessels; and when Russia, and other neutral Powers, complained of this practice, the Cabinet of Madrid replied that, if they would defend their flags against the English, when conveying Spanish effects, that Spain would then respect those flags, even if conveying English goods. The decision of the Russian Court was influenced by two occurrences. A fleet of Dutch merchantmen, bound for the Mediterranean, and convoyed by some ships of war under Count Bylandt, was encountered and stopped by an English squadron under Commodore Fielding; Bylandt made some show of resistance, but submitted, after an exchange of broadsides, and

circumstances, and makes it appear as if the French had always been the friends, the English always the enemies, of a liberal maritime policy. (*Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 453 sqq.) Hence also Coxe's assertion (*Spanish Bourbons*, vol. v. p. 87) that France "had laboured to introduce the principle that neutral ships might carry on the trade, both coasting and general, of hostile nations," appears to be incorrect.

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, v. p. 100.

a few of the merchantmen were captured and carried to Spithead (January 1st, 1780). This affair concerned not only the Dutch, but also all neutral maritime Powers, among which it was a very generally received maxim that neutral ships, under neutral convoy, were exempt from the right of search; the presence of the ships of war being a Government guarantee that the vessels under convoy were not abusing the rights of neutrals. England had not accepted a principle easy of abuse, and which, in fact, the contraband articles in some of the vessels captured sufficiently proved had been abused in this instance. The other occurrence touched Catharine still more nearly. The Spaniards, in conformity with Florida Blanca's policy, having seized two Russian ships in the Mediterranean, the Czarina, at the instance of Sir James Harris (Lord Malmesbury), the English Ambassador, proceeded to fit out a fleet at Cronstadt, to demand satisfaction. Panin at first pretended to approve; but, passing from this incident to general considerations, he chalked out a magnificent plan, founded on the rights of nations, and calculated to rally every people round the Russian flag, and render the Czarina the arbitress of Europe. Catharine, ever dazzled by brilliant ideas, gave her assent to the scheme, without perceiving that it was principally directed against England. Panin immediately seized the opportunity to forward to the Courts of London, Versailles, Madrid, Stockholm, and Copenhagen (February 28th, 1780), a Declaration announcing the four following principles:—1. That neutral vessels may freely navigate from one port to another on the coasts of belligerent nations. 2. That goods, except contraband of war, belonging to the subjects of such belligerent Powers, are free on board of neutral vessels; in other words, that the flag covers the cargo. 3. That with regard to contraband, the Empress adhered to the definition in her commercial treaty with Great Britain, June 20th, 1776. 4. That a blockade, to be effective, must be maintained by vessels sufficiently near to render the entrance of the blockaded port dangerous. And she declared her resolution to uphold these principles by means of an armed force.[1]

This declaration was joyfully received by the Courts of Versailles and Madrid. Great Britain abstained from discussing the principles which it promulgated, and continued to act on the system which she had adopted. That system was certainly contrary to the regulations she had laid down at the Peace of Utrecht in the

[1] See Count Görtz, *Mémoire sur la neutralité armée maritime*, &c. (8vo. Paris, 1805): cf. *Statement* of Florida Blanca, Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. v. App.

treaties between herself, France, and Holland; but she defended her course on the ground that these were only *particular* Conventions, not intended to assert any *general* principle; and that nothing had been said about any such principle in the other treaties which go to make up the Peace of Utrecht. Denmark and Sweden accepted the declaration of Russia, as advantageous to their commerce, and concluded with that Power the treaties which constitute the Armed Neutrality. The King of Denmark further declared to the belligerent Powers (May, 1780) that the Baltic, being in its nature a closed sea, he should not permit their armed vessels to enter it. This regulation was also adopted by Russia and Sweden, and recognized by France.[1] The three Northern Powers agreed to maintain their principles by arms, and to assemble, if necessary, a combined fleet of thirty-five ships.

The Armed Neutrality obtained the approbation of most of the European Courts, as well as of the philosophic writers of the period. The United Netherlands acceded to it January, 3rd, 1781, but not unanimously; the three Provinces of Zealand, Gelderland, and Utrecht, in which the Orange interest prevailed, withheld their consent; Zealand even entered a formal protest against the accession. The King of Prussia, the Emperor Joseph II., Portugal, and the Two Sicilies, also gradually declared their adhesion to the League. Joseph II., however, acceded only to the principles laid down by the League, and not to the Conventions formed on them. That Sovereign took a lively interest in the success of the Bourbon Courts against England, though he was far from approving the American rebellion.[2] After all, however, this great combination produced very insignificant results. Catharine II. soon repented of it, called it the armed *Nullity*, and took no measures to follow it up. After the conclusion of the American war it fell into oblivion, and Europe did not derive from it the advantages which had been anticipated.

The Armed Neutrality was in some degree connected with the rupture between Great Britain and the United Netherlands. Between these countries several disputes had arisen. The English Cabinet had demanded from the States-General certain succours which the Dutch had engaged to supply by the Treaty of Westminster in 1674. The Republic, as we have seen (*supra*, p. 226 sq.), was torn by two factions: the patriot party, which

[1] Martens' *Recueil*, t. ii. p. 84.

[2] When he was in Paris in 1777, a lady having asked his opinion on this subject, he replied, "*Mon métier est d'être royaliste.*" Martin, t. xvi. p. 412.

favoured France, and whose main object was to increase the navy for the protection of commerce; and the Orange party, in the interest of England, which was for maintaining the army on a respectable footing as a security against French aggression. This latter party was for complying with the demand of England for aid, but it was opposed by the Republicans, and in this division of opinion no definitive answer was returned to the application. Paul Jones, the noted pirate, who sailed under the American flag, but who was in reality a Scotchman, having put into the Texel to refit, with two English frigates which he had captured, the States-General not only refused the demand of the British Cabinet for the extradition of Jones, but also declined to detain his prizes. The affair with Count Bylandt, arising out of the practice of the Dutch of conveying to the enemy materials for shipbuilding and contraband articles, has been already related. But the incident which led to the war was the discovery of proof that the Dutch had formed treaties with the United States of America. On September 3rd, 1780, an English frigate having captured an American packet bound for Holland, and carrying Henry Laurens, formerly President of Congress, it was discovered from the papers on board not only that Laurens was authorized to negotiate definitively with the Dutch, but also that a treaty of commerce, fully recognizing the independence of the American States, had been signed by the authority of Van Berkel, the Burgomaster of Amsterdam, so long back as September, 1778. The States-General having refused to disavow or punish Van Berkel and his accomplices, war was declared by England, December 20th, 1780.[1] Great Britain precipitated this step in order to anticipate the accession of the Dutch to the Armed Neutrality, which would place them under the protection of the Northern Powers. The States-General, owing to the dilatoriness inseparable from the form of the Dutch Government, did not, as we have seen, formally accede to that League till January 3rd, 1781, though a majority of the Provinces had resolved on the accession a month or two earlier. The States, pretending that the English declaration of war was the consequence of that step, demanded from the three Northern Powers the aid stipulated to be afforded by the Armed Neutrality to members of the League. But although these Powers

[1] Adolphus, *George III.* vol. iii. p. 222: Martens' *Erzählungen merkw. Fälle*, B. ii. 39. The latter authority, however, states that the Dutch did disavow Van Berkel, though they refused to punish him. M. Martin *liberally* assigns as one cause of the English declaration of war a wish to confiscate Dutch money invested in England. *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 455.

recognized the accession of the Dutch as the cause of the English declaration, they inconsistently excused themselves from giving any help, on the ground that the rupture had occurred before the accession of the Republic. They offered, however, their mediation; but England rejected it, and the Dutch were left to their fate.

The seas were covered with English privateers, and the Dutch commerce suffered immensely. In February, 1781, Rodney seized the Dutch West India Islands St. Eustatia, Saba, and St. Martin, and captured a rich merchant fleet of thirty vessels; which, however, when on its way to England, was retaken by a French squadron and conducted to Brest. The Dutch settlements in Demerara and Essequibo were reduced in March by a detachment of Rodney's fleet. Vice-Admiral Parker, with a far inferior force, attacked off the Doggerbank, August 5th, a Dutch squadron convoying a merchant fleet to the Baltic. The conflict was undecided, and both fleets were much crippled; but the Dutch abandoned their voyage and returned to the Texel. An attempt by Commodore Johnstone on the Cape of Good Hope was unsuccessful. He was attacked off the Cape de Verde Isles by a superior French squadron, under the celebrated Commander, the Bailli de Suffren, who arrived first at the Cape, and took possession of that colony. Suffren then proceeded to the East Indies, where he distinguished himself in several engagements with the English. The French were also successful in the West Indies. The Count de Grasse captured Tobago, June 2nd. The Marquis de Bouillé surprised the English garrison at St. Eustatia in the night of November 25th, and compelled them to surrender. He also took the small adjacent islands, which, with St. Eustatia, were restored to the Dutch.

The result of the campaign in North America was also adverse to the English. Lord Cornwallis, after defeating General Green at Guildford, March 15th, 1711, penetrated into Virginia, captured York Town and Gloucester, and made incursions into the interior. All the enemy's forces were now directed to this quarter. Washington, Rochambeau, and La Fayette, formed a junction in Virginia; the Count de Grasse entered Chesapeake Bay with his fleet, and landed 3,000 men. Cornwallis was now compelled to shut himself up in York Town, and finally, after exhausting all his resources, to capitulate, October 19th. In the South, the Spaniards, by the capture of Pensacola, May 8th, 1781, completed the subjugation of Florida, which they had commenced

in 1779. In Europe they succeeded in recovering the important Island of Minorca. The Duke de Crillon landed with a Spanish army, August 23rd, and laid siege to St. Philip. He endeavoured to bribe the Commandant, General Murray, with 100,000*l.* and the offer of lucrative employment in the Spanish or French service; which proposals were indignantly rejected. After a long siege, in which the Spaniards were aided by a French detachment, sickness and want of provisions compelled General Murray to capitulate, February 5th, 1782, but on honourable terms.

The defeat of Lord Cornwallis, the loss of Minorca, to which was soon added the news of the capture of St. Kitts, Nevis, and Montserrat, by De Grasse (February, 1782), occasioned the downfall of the English Ministry. Lord North, finding himself in a minority, was compelled to retire, March 20th, and was succeeded by the Rockingham Administration, including Fox and Lord Shelburne, the last of whom, on the death of the Marquis of Rockingham in June, became Prime Minister. The views of the new Ministry were directed to peace. One of their first measures, the recall of Admiral Rodney, to whom they had conceived an antipathy, was very unfortunate and unpopular. Before Admiral Pigot, who had been appointed to succeed him, could arrive in the West Indies, Rodney achieved one of the most splendid victories of the war, by defeating the Count de Grasse near Dominica, April 12th, 1782. The French were endeavouring to form a junction with the Spanish fleet at St. Domingo, which, had it been effected, must have resulted in the loss of all the English West India colonies. Five French ships of the line were captured on this occasion, including the Admiral's, and De Grasse was brought prisoner to London.

This year was remarkable by the efforts of the enemy to obtain possession of Gibraltar. Encouraged by their success at Minorca, the Spaniards converted the blockade of Gibraltar, which had lasted three years, into a vigorous siege, directed by the Duke de Crillon, who, including a French division, commanded more than 30,000 men, while the bay was blockaded by more than forty Spanish and French ships of the line. The eyes of all Europe were directed on General Elliot's admirable defence. Two French princes, the Count d'Artois and the Duke of Bourbon, hastened to view this imposing spectacle, and enjoy the anticipated triumph. On September 13th, ten floating batteries, heavily armed, ingeniously constructed by the French Colonel d'Arçon and all thought to be fireproof, were directed against the place, but

they were destroyed with red-hot shot. About a month afterwards Admiral Howe, in face of the greatly superior force of the enemy, which, however had been damaged by a storm, contrived to revictual Gibraltar, and fling in a reinforcement of 1,400 men. The combined fleet subsequently pursued and came up with him near Cadiz, October 20th, when a combat of a few hours had no result. The siege of Gibraltar was now again converted into a blockade.[1] During this year the Dutch concluded with the Americans the treaty of commerce projected in 1778. They had gradually lost all their settlements on the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel. Trincomalee, in Ceylon, surrendered to the English January 11th, 1782, but was retaken by Suffren in the following year. That commander also achieved several victories over Admiral Hughes.

The English Ministry was now earnestly bent on effecting a peace. France had declined the offers of Austria and Russia to mediate, because Great Britain had required as an indispensable base, that France should abandon the American cause. Lord North, a little before his resignation, had attempted direct negotiations at Paris, and this course was also followed by Lord Shelburne. Several envoys were successively despatched to Paris, and on the side of the French, M. Rayneval was sent with a secret commission to London. This eagerness to negotiate increased the demands of France. Vergennes proposed a scheme essentially at variance with the Peace of 1763, and calculated to ruin the commerce and naval power of England. All the captured French colonies were to be restored, while France was to retain many which she had taken. It was also demanded that England should acquiesce in the principles of the Armed Neutrality.

These demands could not be conceded; but at length, in October, 1782, conferences for a definite peace were opened at Paris, under the ostensible mediation of the Emperor and the Czarina, though, in fact, those Sovereigns had no voice in them. The general negotiations were nearly upset by the signing of a secret treaty between Great Britain and America. The discovery of Vergennes' duplicity had produced this result. The French Ministry were, in fact, alarmed at the magnitude of the new Power which they had conjured up in America, and even seem to have apprehended a future league between that

[1] For this famous siege, see Drinkwater, *Account of Siege of Gibraltar*; Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, ch. lxxiv.; D'Arçon, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire du Siège de Gibraltar.*

country and Great Britain, though such an event was highly improbable. Hence, while pretending conciliation, Vergennes endeavoured to sow dissension between the two countries, as well as to weaken the new Republic. With this view he secretly instigated the Americans to claim, and the English to withhold, a share in the Newfoundland Fishery. But what induced the Americans to conclude with Great Britain was a despatch of Marbois, the French agent at Philadelphia, to his Government, in which, at their desire, he had drawn up an elaborate plan for dividing and weakening the new Republic. This despatch being intercepted by an English cruiser, was forwarded by the Government to Mr. Oswald, a merchant and shipowner whom Lord Shelburne had employed to negotiate with the American Commissioners at Paris. The production of this despatch filled them with such indignation that, as the English Government had now resolved to concede American independence, they signed the preliminaries of a peace with Great Britain without the knowledge of M. de Vergennes, November 30th, 1782.[1] The French Minister, on being acquainted with this step, bitterly reproached the American Commissioners, who excused themselves by protesting that the treaty should not be definitive till France and Spain had also terminated their arrangements with England. The English Cabinet used the advantage they had obtained to press on France the necessity for a speedy conclusion of the negotiations: the financial condition of that country rendered a peace desirable; and on January 20th, 1783, preliminaries were signed at Versailles between Great Britain, France, and Spain. The Dutch, who, from the forms of their constitution, moved very slowly, and who had refused to enter into separate negotiations with England, were thus left without help, though a suspension of arms was agreed upon, and Louis XVI. promised to use his good offices that the Republic might obtain an honourable peace. After the ratification of the peace between Great Britain and America in August, Vergennes, however, told the Dutch Ministers that the definitive treaty between France, Spain, and Great Britain could no longer be delayed, and the States-General were compelled to sign preliminaries with the last-named Power on the terms which she had demanded (September 2nd).[2] The definitive treaties of the Peace of Versailles,

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. v. p. 1 sqq.; *House of Austria*, vol. ii. p. 603 (ed. 1807). The American Commissioners were John Adams, Benj Franklin, John Jay, and Henry Laurens. Franklin, who entertained a bitter animosity towards Great Britain, at first objected, but was overruled.

[2] Martens, t. ii. p. 457.

between Great Britain, the United States of America, France, and Spain, were signed on the following day. By the treaty with America, Great Britain recognized the thirteen United States as sovereign and independent. The second article, defining boundaries, comprised vast regions inhabited by unsubjected races, which belonged to neither of the contracting parties. The American loyalists were rewarded with lands in Nova Scotia, or pensions in Great Britain.[1]

The loss of the American colonies to the mother-country was rather apparent than real. They contributed nothing to the British treasury; and though the commercial monopoly was lost, the trade between the two countries actually went on increasing after the peace of Versailles, as the agricultural population of America could not dispense with British manufactures.

By the definitive treaty with France that country acquired Tobago (assigned to Great Britain by the peace of 1763), as well as the establishments on the Senegal. All other conquests were restored on both sides. France was delivered from the commissaries residing at Dunkirk since the Peace of Utrecht, and her political consideration seemed placed on a better footing than at the peace of 1763. But, on the other hand, she had rendered the disorder of her finances irretrievable, and thus hastened the catastrophe of the Revolution. She not only abandoned the Dutch, but also her ally, Tippoo Saib, Sultan of Mysore, the son and successor of Hyder Ally. It was stipulated that the Peace of Versailles should be followed by a commercial treaty between France and England, which was accordingly concluded at Paris, September 26th, 1786. By the 20th Article it was established that the neutral flag covers the cargo, except, of course, contraband of war.

Spain was the greatest gainer by the peace, the best she had made since that of St. Quintin. She recovered Minorca and the two Floridas; but she was reluctantly compelled to abandon Gibraltar. Count d'Aranda, the Spanish Plenipotentiary, displayed great violence on this subject. He declared that his Sovereign would never consent to a peace without the restoration of that fortress, and he was encouraged in this course by Vergennes and Franklin. At an early period of the negotiations Lord Shelburne had seemed disposed to cede Gibraltar, but became alarmed on finding how much the heart of the English

[1] Jenkinson (Lord Liverpool), *Collection of Treaties*, vol. iii. p. 410; Martens, t. ii. p. 497.

people was set upon that rock, now doubly endeared to it by Elliot's glorious defence; and its retention became a *sine quâ non* with the British Ministry, though Spain showed a disposition to give Porto Rico and Oran in exchange for it.[1]

The definitive treaty between Great Britain and the States-General was not signed till May 20th, 1784. Negapatam was ceded to England; but a more important concession was, that British navigation should not be molested in the Indian seas, where the Dutch had hitherto maintained an exclusive commerce.[2]

The Peace of Versailles was received with loud murmurs in England. Lord Shelburne was driven from the helm, and was succeeded by the Duke of Portland and the Coalition Ministry. Yet, on the whole, considering the extent and power of the combination formed against her, England seems to have escaped better than might have been anticipated. France, meanwhile, in spite of her apparently advantageous peace, was rapidly sinking both at home and abroad. We have seen in the preceding chapter that in the affairs between Holland, her *protégée*, and the Emperor, Joseph II., she no longer ventured to assume that haughty tone to which she had formerly been accustomed. The French people were shocked by the payment of a sum of money to Joseph on that occasion; which was ascribed to the Austrian influence of Marie Antoinette, and increased her unpopularity. The character of Marie Antoinette, which bore a considerable resemblance to that of her brother Joseph II., made her the easy victim of malice. Lively and impetuous, governed by her feelings rather than by reflection, badly educated and of unregulated judgment, she exposed herself from the first day of her entry into France to the calumnies of her enemies. These were chiefly to be found in the party of Madame du Barri, and among the ex-Jesuits, who regarded her marriage as the work of Choiseul. Among them was her own brother-in-law, the Count of Provence, afterwards Louis XVIII. The celebrated affair of the diamond necklace, which happened about the time of the Dutch Treaty, also contributed to injure her in the public opinion. This necklace, worth 1,600,000 francs, had been ordered by the Cardinal de Rohan, as he affirmed, for the Queen, by order of the Countess de La Motte Valois; but the Queen, when applied to by the jeweller for payment, denied all knowledge of the matter. It is impossible for us to enter into all the particulars of this mysterious transaction, which would demand

[1] Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, vol. v. p. 140 sq.

[2] The treaties are in Jenkinson, vol. iii. p. 334; Martens, t. ii. p. 462, and p. 520.

several pages. The questions at issue were, whether the Queen had really ordered the necklace and wished to evade paying for it; whether Madame de La Motte had falsely used the Queen's name, with a view to appropriate the jewels for herself; or whether Rohan was the swindler.[1] The Cardinal was notoriously expensive, profligate, and unscrupulous. He openly professed that his enormous income of 1,200,000 francs sufficed not for a gentleman; and he paid his mistresses by defrauding the poor of the money which passed through his hands as almoner. But the Court took an imprudent step in dragging the matter before the Parliament of Paris. Rohan, Bishop of Strasburg and Grand-Almoner of the Crown, a member of the family of Condé, was seized at Versailles in his pontifical robes as he was about to enter the chapel, and conducted to the Bastille (August, 1785). He, and Madame de La Motte and her husband, were then arraigned before the Parliament; the first time that a Prince of the Church had been brought before a secular judge. The trial, a great public scandal, lasted nine months, affording a rich treat to curiosity and malice. The efforts of the Court to procure the acquittal of Madame de La Motte had only the effect of turning public opinion the other way. The Parliament, glad of an opportunity to avenge the affronts it had received, acquitted Rohan by a majority of five, and condemned Madame de La Motte and her husband to be whipped and branded; after which the latter was to be sent to the galleys, and the lady to the Salpêtrière. The public hailed with frantic joy a decree that degraded the Throne, while the Cardinal was honoured with a complete ovation. The Queen avenged herself by banishing Rohan to Auvergne by a *lettre de cachet*.

While the Court was thus plunging deeper into public odium, the ever-declining state of the finances threatened a national bankruptcy. Necker had for some time made head against the *deficit* by reforms, reductions of expenditure, and especially by loans. Credit, however, the only support of the last method, began to get exhausted; and in order to revive the public confidence, Necker persuaded Louis XVI. to publish the celebrated *Compte rendu* (January, 1781). The effect at first was prodigious. The public was overwhelmed with joy at being for the first time intrusted with the secret of the national balance-sheet. The statement, too, seemed really satisfactory. The receipts appeared to exceed the ordinary

[1] M. L. Blanc, in his *Hist. de la Révol. Franç.* t. ii. ch. 4, has produced some fresh evidence against the Queen, whom he considers guilty. Yet, on his own showing, the probabilities are, we think, in her favour.

disbursements by eighteen million livres; while the promise of extinguishing a great part of the enormous sum paid in pensions, of reforming the system of taxation, &c., showed a sincere disposition to amend past disorders. In the first moments of enthusiasm Necker succeeded in raising an enormous loan. But gradually the enchanting visions of the *Compte rendu* began to melt away. The statement was found to be anything but trustworthy, and the asserted surplus a pure delusion. On the other hand, the persons interested in the abuses denounced, with De Vergennes at the head of them, began to league themselves against Necker, and in May, 1781, he found himself compelled to tender his resignation. The management of the finances, after passing through two or three hands, came, in October, 1783, into those of Calonne, a frivolous man of profligate morals, with a reputation for talent. During two or three years, by clever expedients, and especially by loans, Calonne contrived to keep the machine in motion, and even to carry on a reckless expenditure. But at length his subterfuges were exhausted; he was compelled to acknowledge a *deficit* of 100 millions (four millions sterling) per annum, and to consider the alternative of a national bankruptcy or a thorough reform of the State. The first of these, in the state of public feeling, could not be contemplated a moment. On the other hand, reform seemed almost equally dangerous. It could not be effected through the Parliaments, the only constitutional bodies in the State, as they would resist the diminution of their privileges which it involved; while an appeal to the people, and the assembling of the *Etats généraux*, seemed fraught with danger. In this perplexity Calonne hit upon a middle term, an Assembly of Notables, which had sometimes been convoked in the exigencies of the kingdom.

The Notables, to the number of 144, were accordingly assembled at Versailles, January 29th, 1787. The *Tiers état*, or commons, was represented by only six or seven municipal magistrates; all the rest were clergy and nobles, or persons having the privileges of nobles. The Assembly had been announced in the *Journal de Paris* in the most offensive terms, intimating that the nation should be transported with joy at the condescension of the King in appealing to it.[1] The Count de Vergennes died before the Assembly proceeded to business. He was succeeded by the Count de Montmorin, a respectable man, but quite unequal to the position. The Assembly was opened by the King,

[1] "La nation verra avec transport que son souverain daigne s'approcher d'elle."

February 22nd. Calonne, in an elaborate and clever, but indiscreet and presumptuous address, communicated his plans to the Notables. The main feature of them was the abolition or reform of some obnoxious imposts, and the substitution for them of a land-tax, varying from one-fortieth to one-twentieth, to be received in kind, and to which all orders alike were to be liable, including the clergy and even the royal domains. On the other hand, the privileged classes were to be relieved from the *capitation*, or poll-tax, to which *roturiers* were still to be subject, as well as to the *taille*, but at a largely reduced rate. Calonne also proposed a stamp act, and a reduction of the public expenditure, including that of the King's household. It was soon evident, however, that the proceedings of an Assembly not based upon popular representation could never be satisfactory.[1] Irritated by the opposition of the Notables, Calonne threatened them with an appeal to the people. This threat produced an almost universal coalition against him, which was joined by the Queen. The King's brother, afterwards Louis XVIII., had made himself conspicuous by his opposition; and almost the only supporter of Calonne was the Count d'Artois, afterwards Charles X. Among his most formidable adversaries was Necker, whose *Compte rendu* he had attacked. That document was not invulnerable; but Necker proved that Calonne had wrongfully accused him of not having left a sufficient sum in the treasury to cover the expenses of 1781. The result of the league against Calonne was, that, at the instigation of Marie Antoinette, he was dismissed. Necker's turn, however, was not yet come. In fact he also was banished twenty leagues from Paris, for having ventured to publish without permission an apologetic memoir.

Calonne was succeeded by Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, with the title of Chief of the Council of Finance; while the Controller Fourqueux was little more than a head clerk. Brienne had been among the foremost of Calonne's opponents; yet he found himself compelled to bring forward several of his plans. Amid the stormy discussions which ensued, La Fayette proposed the convocation of a *National Assembly* within five years. The

[1] Mirabeau's father characterized the Assembly vigorously, though somewhat coarsely, as follows: "Cet homme (Calonne) assemble une troupe de *guillots*" (*guillemots?* a sort of stupid-looking bird.—Bouillet) "qu'il appelle nation, pour leur donner la vache par les cornes, et leur dire: 'Messieurs, nous tirons tout, et le par-de-là; et nous allons tâcher de trouver le moyen de ce par-de-là sur les riches, dont l'argent n'a rien de commun avec les pauvres; et nous vous avertissons que les riches, c'est vous; dites-nous maintenant votre avis sur la manière.'" *Mém.* de Mirabeau, ap. Martin, t. xvi. p. 568.

Notables would not take upon themselves the responsibility of voting the taxes proposed. They left the decision to the King; in other words, they resigned their functions. The Government now proceeded to publish edicts in conformity with the plans of taxation proposed by Colonne. When the edict for raising stamp duties was brought before the Parliament of Paris, that body refused to register it without first receiving a statement of the public accounts; and ended by beseeching the King to withdraw the edict, and by declaring that the *Etats généraux* alone were entitled to grant the King the necessary supplies. Such was the extraordinary change in public opinion! The Parliament, formerly so opposed to these National Assemblies, now declared them indispensable. The King frustrated the opposition of the Parliament by causing the different edicts to be registered in a *Lit de Justice*, and when they protested against this step, he banished them to Troies; where, however, their opposition only became more violent. The feeling which animated them spread through all ranks of the people. It was taken up by the *clubs* recently established in Paris in imitation of the English. The Minister caused them to be closed. Popular hatred had fixed itself on the Queen more than the King. The irritation against her had reached so high a pitch that Louis XVI. forbade her to show herself in Paris.

The fermentation spread through the Kingdom. The provincial Parliaments loudly denounced the banishment of that of Paris, demanded the convocation of the *Etats généraux*, and the indictment of Calonne. Brienne compromised matters by allowing the Parliament to return, and engaging to call the *Etats* in 1792. The return of the Parliament to Paris was celebrated by an illumination, accompanied with serious riots, in which Calonne, who had escaped to England, was burnt in effigy. Brienne hoped for four years to re-establish the finances, so that the meeting of the *Etats* in 1792 should be a mere parade and spectacle. But Count de Mirabeau, who now began to play a prominent part, incited the Parliament to demand that they should be assembled in 1789; and a loan of 120 millions was agreed to by the Parliament only on this condition. The King was present at the sitting, which was suddenly converted into a *Lit de Justice*, and Louis decreed the registry of the edict for the loan in the usual forms, amid the murmurs of the Assembly. The Duke of Orleans rose, and ventured to observe that the step appeared to him illegal. Louis hesitated, stammered, and at length faltered out—"Yes;

it is legal, if it is my will." The protest of the Duke was recorded, but he was banished to Viller Cotterets, and two counsellors, supposed to have incited him, were imprisoned.

The disputes between the Court and Parliament continued more violently than ever. Among the parliamentary agitators, Duport and D'Eprémesnil were conspicuous. The boldest sentiments were uttered in the name of law and liberty. It having been discovered that the Court was preparing edicts, intended to strike a blow at the Parliaments, of which proof-sheets were obtained by means of a printer's boy, meetings to organize resistance were held at Duport's house, and were attended by La Fayette, Condorcet, the Duke de la Rochefoucauld, Talleyrand-Périgord, the famous Bishop of Autun, and others. On May 3rd, 1788, the Parliament, having drawn up a sort of Remonstrance and Declaration of Rights, the King, two days after, caused Goislard and D'Eprémesnil, the chief promoters of them, to be seized in their places and thrown into prison. On the 8th the Parliament was summoned to Versailles to hear the edicts read. Their effect was, in a great measure, to supersede the Parliaments, by substituting other Courts for them, and especially a *Cour plénière*. At the same time resort was to be had to *Etats généraux* whenever the public necessities should require it. It was, in fact, a new Constitution, many of the features of which were excellent. But it was clearly perceived that the object of the Court was only to temporize, and to cover despotism under the veil of progress and reform. The provincial Parliaments, and especially those of Brittany and Dauphiné, displayed the most violent resistance against the edicts. The latter may be said to have initiated the Revolution by the first act of the sovereignty of the people. The Parliament, having been banished by the Government, the citizens of Grenoble assembled at the Hôtel de Ville in August and decreed the spontaneous Assembly of the States of Dauphiné, which had fallen into desuetude for many generations. They were accordingly held at the Château de Vizille, and the Government found itself compelled to come to a compromise with them. Everything seemed to threaten universal anarchy. As a last resource, Brienne assembled the clergy, in hope that the danger with which their order was threatened by a meeting of the *Etats généraux* would induce them to grant him a loan, and thus obviate the necessity for that Assembly. Vain hope! the clergy sided with the Parliaments, their ancient adversaries, and demanded the *Etats;* at the same time protesting,

with a ludicrous inconsistency, against ecclesiastical property being subjected to taxation! Brienne now found it impossible to resist the popular voice. The *Etats généraux* were summoned for May 1st, 1789; and, meanwhile, the establishment of the *Cour plénière* was suspended. Brienne, after some steps which very much resembled a national bankruptcy, found himself compelled to resign, and Louis had no alternative but to recall Necker. Brienne's retirement was soon after followed by that of Lamoignon. Serious riots occurred on both occasions, the latter being attended almost with a massacre.

With the return of Necker financial prospects revived. His second Ministry closes the ancient *régime*. By engaging his personal fortune and other methods, he contrived to tide the nation over the few months which preceded the Revolution. The Parliament was now re-established for the second time during this reign. But it lost its popularity by enregistering the Royal Declaration that the *Etats généraux* should be convoked according to the form observed in 1614; which implied that their votes should be taken by orders and not *per capita*. Necker, however, though a good financier, was a mediocre statesman. He reassembled the Notables to decide on the composition of the *Tiers état*, or Commons. That Assembly adhered to ancient forms as to the number to be summoned, but sanctioned a democratic constitution of the Commons. Necker nevertheless persuaded the King to summon at least 1,000 persons, of whom the *Tiers état* was to consist of as many as the other two orders united, or half the whole Assembly. This concession, which had been demanded by most of the municipalities, would, as Necker pretended, be unimportant, if the States were to vote by orders, according to ancient custom; yet in a Report to the King previously to the Royal Declaration of December 27th, 1788, he appears already to have anticipated their voluntary union in certain cases.

The *Etats généraux*, elected amid great excitement, were opened by the King, May 5th, 1789. The Assembly consisted, in all, of 1145 members, of whom more than one-half belonged to the *Tiers état*. The first business was to verify the returns. For this purpose the Commons invited the other two orders to the great hall in which they sat; but as this proceeding would also have implied the mode of voting, that is *en masse*, the nobles and clergy declined the proposal, although the latter order consented to a conference. The Commons refused to proceed to business, and nothing was done for several weeks; till, on the motion of

the Abbé Sieyès,[1] deputy of the *Tiers état* of Paris, a last invitation was sent to the clergy and nobles (June 10th), and on their failing to appear, the Commons proceeded to business. After the verification of powers, Sieyès, in spite of the opposition of Mirabeau, moved and carried that the *Etats* should assume the title of the NATIONAL ASSEMBLY. The Revolution had begun!

[1] Sieyès had previously traced the plan of operations, and laid down the programme of the Revolution, in his celebrated pamphlet, entitled, *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers Etat?*

CHAPTER LII.

THE celebrated phrase of Louis XIV., "I am the State," proclaimed the consummation of despotism. He asserted, and it was true, that the people, as a body politic, had been annulled by the Crown. Before a century had elapsed the maxim was reversed. The head of Louis's second successor fell upon the scaffold, and the revolutionary disciples of Rousseau established the principle that the real sovereign is the people itself. Hence it would appear that, for all practical purposes, the causes of the French Revolution may be sought between the reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XVI.; or, in other words, that the inquiry may be limited to the nature of the institutions left by the former monarch, and the causes which gradually led the people to desire their overthrow under the latter. Even within these limits the extent of the subject might demand a volume rather than a chapter. We can pretend only to indicate its principal heads, leaving the historical student to fill up the outline from his own researches and reflections.

It would be a great mistake to consider the French Revolution merely as a political one. It was likewise a social revolution of the most extensive kind. Hence its peculiar character and its most abiding results. Many nations have experienced as sudden and violent a change in their political institutions; few or none have undergone, in a similar period of time, so complete an alteration in their habits and manners.

One of the most striking defects in the French social system under the old *régime* was the anomalous position of the nobility. The vast power of the old nobles in the early days of the French monarchy caused the Crown to regard them as rivals, and to court against them the aid of the people. This traditional policy even survived the occasion of it, and down to the very eve of the Revolution, Louis XVI. continued to regard the aristocracy as his most dangerous enemies.[1] Louis XI. and his successors had

[1] Burke's observation to this effect is quoted with approbation by M. Tocqueville, *H. de l'Ancien Régime*, p. 218.

begun to undermine their power, which was terribly shaken by the wars of the League, and finally overthrown by Richelieu. One of the most successful measures adopted by the Cardinal Minister for that purpose was, to entice the nobles to reside in Paris by the attractions of that capital, and thus to destroy their influence in their own provinces; a policy which was continued by Louis XIV. and his successors. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the abandonment of their estates for a town life had become almost general among the nobles; few remained in the provinces who had the means of living with becoming splendour in the capital. The dissipation and extravagance in which they thus became involved leading to their gradual impoverishment, they were compelled to sell their lands bit by bit; so that in the reign of Louis XVI. it was computed that five-eighths of all the land in France was in the hands of *roturiers*,[1] and for the most part of very small proprietors. Arthur Young, who travelled in France at the outbreak of the Revolution, had often seen a property of ten rods with only a single fruit tree upon it.

As the policy of Richelieu depressed the nobles, so it tended to enrich and elevate the *Tiers état*, or commons. The inhabitants of towns, the commercial and manufacturing classes, made rapid progress. The advance of the French people in wealth and civilization after Richelieu's Ministry is depicted in glowing colours by an author who has made that epoch his peculiar study.[2] The high roads of the kingdom, previously infested by brigands, became safe channels for the operations of trade and industry. Abundance everywhere prevailed; the fields were covered with rich crops, the towns were animated with commerce and embellished by the arts. The impulse once given went on increasing. Hence the *Tiers état* which attended the States-General of 1789 bore but little resemblance to their predecessors a century or two before. Wealth had given them weight and importance; education had sharpened their intelligence, opened their eyes to the

[1] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des causes de la Révolution Française*, t. i. p. 151. This computation seems much too high, but authorities on the subject differ very much. According to Arthur Young, only one-third of the land was in the hands of small proprietors; while Leonce de Lavergne (quoted by M. Taine, *Ancien Régime*, p. 18) says that two-fifths were held by the *Tiers état* and peasantry, the rest, except common lands, by the nobles, clergy, and Crown. The effects of the Revolution seem to have been to leave the peasantry much where they were, but vastly to increase the landed possessions of the *Tiers état*, at the expense, of course, of the higher classes (See Von Sybel, *Gesch. der Revolutions-zeit*, vol. i. p. 23 sq. Eng. Trans.). This result might have been expected from the many voluntary and compulsory sales during the Revolution, and especially of the Church lands.

[2] Jay, *Hist. du Ministère du Cardinal Richelieu*, t. ii. p. 226 sqq.

political and social abuses which prevailed, and inspired them with the desire of obtaining that influence and consideration in the State to which their altered condition justly entitled them. But this glowing picture must be estimated only by comparison; and the peasantry at least, as we shall presently see, instead of sharing in this advance, had terribly retrograded.

Richelieu's policy was ultimately followed by effects which he had neither foreseen nor intended. It contributed, in short, to make the Revolution possible. Hence the different views which have been taken by French political writers of Richelieu's character. The advocates of a constitutional monarchy, regarding a substantial aristocracy as the only sure support of a solid liberty, utterly condemn the policy of Richelieu. Montesquieu, in his *Pensées*, calls him one of the worst citizens that France had ever seen; and the same view is adopted by Madame de Stäel, in her *Considérations sur la Révolution Française*. Ultra-democratic writers, on the contrary, look upon the great Cardinal Minister as a deliverer from aristocratic tyranny, in fact, as the founder of the French nation. In their view, a royal despotism is more endurable, and more favourable to the progress of civilization, than the despotism of an aristocracy, because it is less extensively felt, and because it is more amenable to the control of public opinion, and of such protective institutions, however imperfect, as France possessed, for instance, in her Parliaments. That Louis XI. was an unfeeling tyrant, that Richelieu, as appears from his *Testament Politique*, in his heart contemned the people, is disregarded by such writers. They look only to the results, and contend, not without some show of reason, that such rulers are unjustly charged with introducing a despotism, which had, in fact, existed long before.[1] They even acknowledge a sentiment of gratitude towards them, as the founders of the French nationality, and in this sense the authors of the Revolution. In this reasoning we behold that apparently paradoxical, but really natural alliance between extreme democracy and absolutism, which seems so suitable to the genius of the French, and which manifested itself even during the wildest excesses of the Revolution; when royal tyranny was replaced by that of a virtual dictatorship.

But whilst in the eighteenth century the wealth and the political influence of the French nobility were almost annihilated, a titular aristocracy still remained, possessing many of the peculiar and invidious privileges of the feudal times. Although the nobles were

[1] See Bailleul, *Examen crit. de l'ouvrage de Madame de Stäel*, t. i. p. 46.

no longer obliged to make war at their own expense,[1] although they were now enregimented and received the King's pay, yet they still enjoyed that immunity from direct taxation which had been accorded to them for their military services. The profession of arms, however, was still considered as the proper destination of the nobility, and a sort of monopoly of their order. No man, except of noble birth, could become a military officer. On the very eve of the Revolution, a lieutenant in a marching regiment had to prove a nobility of at least four generations. The nobles also enjoyed a monopoly of the greater civil offices. These exclusive privileges tended to make the *noblesse* a sort of caste. A noble who engaged in trade or commerce forfeited his rights and privileges.[2] As it is computed that there were in France, in 1789, 40,000 noble families, comprising some 200,000 persons,[3] the invidiousness of these privileges must have been very extensively felt. Of the whole nobility, however, there were not 200 families really belonging to those ancient races which prided themselves, though mostly without foundation, on their Frankish origin, and on holding their estates and dignities by right of conquest. Their titles had been mostly purchased. The practice of selling patents of nobility had been adopted by the French kings at a very early period, though it was not carried to any great extent till the sixteenth century. It was resorted to partly as a means of depressing the order, partly as an expedient to raise money. Charles IX. issued a vast number of these patents, and his successor, Henry III., is said to have created no fewer than a thousand nobles. *Roturiers* were sometimes compelled to buy these patents, which were even issued with the name in blank. Louis XIV. granted 500 letters of nobility in a single year.

The feudal privileges enjoyed by the nobles, or by those who had stepped into their places, were very grievously felt in the rural districts. Even where the land was no longer in the hands of a seigneur, the feudal rights attached to it, or what was called *la servitude de la terre,* still remained in force, though held perhaps, by neighbouring proprietors, almost as poor as the peasant who was subject to them.[3] In some instances these rights had

[1] The *ban* and *arrière ban*, a vast and undisciplined mob which the nobles had been accustomed to furnish, was called out for the last time in 1674. Michelet, *Révol. Française*, Introd. p. ci.

[2] Glass-making alone seems to have been excepted. *Granier de Cassagnac*, t. i. p. 141. A noble degraded by commerce might, however, reinstate himself by purchasing *lettres de réhabilitation.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 146. Some writers, however, estimate them considerably lower. M. Taine (*Anc. Régime*, App. note 1) computes them at 26,000 or 28,000 families, and 130,000 or 140,000 individuals.

[4] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, liv. ii. ch. i.

been acquired by the Crown, and the peasant was compelled to labour gratuitously, often at a distance from his home, in making roads, building barracks, and other works of a like description, experiencing, at the same time, the most brutal and unfeeling treatment. Besides this compulsory task-work, called the *corvée*, the peasant saw his fields exposed, without defence, to the ravages of game; he was obliged to pay heavy market-tolls, to make use of a certain ferry, to have his corn ground at a particular mill, his bread baked at a particular oven. Not the least among these feudal grievances were the *justices seigneuriales*, or private courts of justice attached to certain titles and possessions. The proprietors of these courts, of which there are said to have been more than 2,400, leagued themselves with the Parliaments against the reforms in the administration of justice proposed by the Royal Edict of May 8th, 1788; in the preamble of which it is stated that trifling civil causes had often to undergo six hearings.

Noble proprietors were commonly absentees, and left their estates to be managed by agents, whose only object it was to extort as much as they could from the peasantry. The smaller landowners had not the means of properly cultivating their land, nor of laying anything by, so that a bad year brought actual famine and deaths by thousands. The misery of the agricultural districts at the close of the 17th century, and during the following one, exceeds all imagination. La Bruèyre, writing about 1689, describes the rural population as resembling wild animals in their appearance and way of life. Massillon, Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, tells Cardinal Fleury, in 1740, that the misery of the rural population was frightful; they had neither beds nor furniture; for half the year, in spite of their industry, the greater part of them were without the barley or oaten bread which constituted their only food, of which they were obliged to deprive themselves and their children in order to pay the taxes; in short, the negroes in the French colonies were infinitely happier. We hear of their being forced to resort to the herbs of the field and the bark of trees to appease the cravings of hunger. Official memoirs of 1698 state that many districts had lost from the sixth to the half (!) of their population. Between that time and 1715 the population of France is said to have decreased by more than two millions, and from that period to the middle of the century it made no advance.[1]

[1] Taine, *Anc. Régime*, liv. v. ch. i., where many more details will be found. Cf. Von Sybel, p. 25 sq.

The nobles, having often little interest in the land except the title and the feudal privileges, without any consideration for those who were subject to them, it requires no very profound knowledge of human nature to foretell the consequences of such a relationship between the privileged and non-privileged classes. Where great pretensions are supported by little real power, pride becomes more sensitive and exacting; while in those subjected to its caprices, contempt mingles with hatred. Madame de Stäel, an acute observer of her own times, remarks that the different classes in France entertained a mutual antipathy for one another.[1] In no other country were the gentry so estranged from the rest of the nation; their contact with those below them served only to wound. Hence even the elegant manners of the *noblesse*, the most estimable part, perhaps, of the ancient *régime*, which it was difficult to imitate,[2] served only to increase the envy inspired by the exclusive prerogatives of that class: a circumstance which may account for much of the cynicism and *sans-culotterie* of the Revolution.

The burgesses, like the peasantry, were oppressed by peculiar burdens originating in the middle ages. The trade of France was monopolized by guilds and corporations, which fettered independent industry by a system of *maîtrises* and *jurandes* (masterships and wardenships), and thus even the *bourgeoisie* had its aristocracy. A stranger, or non-freeman, could not become an apprentice even to the meanest trade, without paying a considerable premium. On the expiration of his apprenticeship, a young man became a *compagnon* and was entitled to wages; but a long interval must still elapse before he could set up for himself as a *maître juré*, or master in his trade; and this again entailed heavy expenses. Even a Paris flower-girl had to pay 200 livres to become a *maîtresse*. On the other hand, the son of a *maître* could avoid these expenses by being apprenticed to his father. Hence trades came to be perpetuated in certain families, and an exclusive system was formed which gave occasion to perpetual disputes. The publishers were continually disputing with the booksellers as to the difference between an old book and a new one; and many thousand lawsuits are said to have taken place between the tailors and second-hand clothiers without settling the distinction between a new coat and an old one. The very beggars had their privileges, and it was only those belonging to

[1] *Considérations, &c.* partie iii. ch. xv.

[2] The manners of the period are amusingly described in the second book of M. Taine's *Anc. Régime.*

a certain order, called *trôniers*, who were entitled to ask alms at the door of a church.[1]

Among other relics of the feudal times, the ecclesiastical system of France was diametrically opposed to the growing spirit of the age. We now speak of the French Church only as a corporation. The clergy were a landed aristocracy, and like the nobles, were exempt from direct taxation; or rather, they claimed the privilege of taxing themselves by what were called *dons gratuits*, or voluntary offerings. The collection of tithes brought them into direct collision with that numerous body of small landed proprietors which, as we have already said, had now sprung up in France; and thus the notice of an inquiring age was all the more strongly attracted to the flagrant abuses which prevailed in the Church. The higher ecclesiastical dignities were mostly filled by the younger sons of noble families, and were no longer, according to the spirit of their institution, the rewards of virtue, piety, and a zealous discharge of holy functions. While some of the hierarchy were rolling in untold wealth, and displaying anything but those Christian virtues which should characterize their profession, the ecclesiastics who really performed the duties of the Church had in many cases scarcely wherewithal to support a decent existence. The abuses of the property belonging to the regular clergy, or monastic orders, were especially notorious. The revenues of many abbeys, so far from being applied to ecclesiastical purposes, were often enjoyed by laymen.

The arbitrary power of the Crown shared the hatred felt by the people for the privileges of the aristocracy, both lay and clerical. The French Government was, indeed, both in theory and practice, a perfect despotism. The King was the only legislative and supreme executive power. As he claimed to be the sole proprietor and absolute lord of all France, he could dispose of the property of his subjects by imposts and confiscations, and of their persons by *lettres de cachet*. Thus France had no Constitution; which is equivalent to saying that the social structure had no secure foundation. Had the States-General or National Assembly continued to subsist, and been regularly convened, the long-standing abuses which we have described would probably have been gradually abolished, instead of remaining to be swept away by the convulsions of a revolution; but having been suffered to accumulate for ages, they at length exploded, to the destruction

[1] See L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Franç.*, t. i. liv. iii. ch. 3.

of the system which contained them, like steam pent up withou a safety-valve. The only constitutional principle which could b perceived was, as Madame de Stäel observes, that the Crow was hereditary. Public opinion, and the passive and unavailing resistance of the Parliaments, were the sole checks upon th exercise of the Royal prerogative. A dangerous result of th all-disposing power of the Crown was that the people looked u to it for everything, even for aid in their private affairs, and at tributed to it the most inevitable calamities. If agriculture wa in a bad state, it was ascribed to want of succour from th Government; in times of scarcity, which frequently occurred i the eighteenth century, the different districts looked to thei *Intendant* for food.. Every misery, even the badness of th seasons, was imputed to the Government.[1] It is easy to see ho such a feeling might become, in times of commotion, a dangerou element of discontent; nor will proofs of such effects be wantin in the following narrative. The caprices and injustice of th Government added to the general indignation. Royal domain which had been sold were reseized; privileges granted in perpetuit were constantly revoked. Towns, communities, even hospital and charitable institutions, were compelled to fail in their engage ments in order to lend money to the Crown.

Besides the invidious and oppressive privileges of the noble the monopolies of guilds and corporations, the abuses in th hierarchy, and the arbitrary power of the Sovereign, the ano malous condition of the French provinces was another source c discontent. Although Richelieu had consolidated the authorit of the Crown throughout France, he had not amalgamated it various provinces; which differed so widely in their system of law, religion, and finance, that they could hardly be said t form one kingdom. There were Gascons, Normans, Breton Provençals, &c., but a French nation could hardly be said t exist. There was France of the *Langue d'oc*, subject to th Roman law, and France of the *Langue d'oil*, obeying the commo law; France of the *Concordat*, and France of the *Pays d'obédienc* more immediately subject to the Papal power; France of th *Pays d'élection* and France of the *Pays d'états*. These anomalie chiefly arose from the gradual manner in which the Monarchy ha been developed. Down to the twelfth century the patrimony c the French Crown continued to be only the province of the Isl of France, with Paris for its capital, together with the Orleana

[1] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 106 sq.

and a few adjacent districts. The King's authority over the rest of France was rather that of a feudal suzerain than of a Sovereign. By marriage, bequest, confiscation, conquest and other means, related in the preceding pages, these slender possessions had been augmented before the reign of Louis XVI. to between thirty and forty provinces; embracing, with the exception of Avignon and the Venaissin, which still belonged to the Pope, the whole of modern France.

Of these provinces, acquired at such different times and in such various ways, many had continued to retain their peculiar laws and privileges. On a general view, the most important distinction between them was that of *Pays d'élection* and *Pays d'états*. The *Pays d'élection* were so called because originally the territorial taxes were assessed by certain magistrates called *élus* (persons chosen or elected), whose fiscal jurisdiction was entitled an *Election*. In early times these magistrates had really been chosen by the communities, a practice which ceased under Charles VII., though the name was still retained. As a general rule, the *Pays d'élection* were the provinces most anciently united to the Crown. The *Pays d'états* derived their name from the *states*, or administrative assemblies, which they had possessed before their union with the French Realm, and were allowed subsequently to retain. The provinces comprised under this name were Rousillon, Brittany, Provence, Languedoc, Burgundy Franche-Comté, Dauphiné, Alsace, the *Trois Evêchés* (Metz, Toul, and Verdun), Flanders, Hainault, Lorraine, and Corsica. In these provinces the administration was vested, nominally, at least—for the authority of the Crown often overrode their ancient constitutions—in the States. The right of sitting in these assemblies, was attached, with regard to the clergy, to certain preferments, with regard to the nobles, to certain families, and with regard to the *Tiers état*, or burgesses, to certain offices. Some of these provinces, by virtue of treaties concluded with the Crown, claimed an immunity from various taxes. In such cases the Crown fixed the contribution of each province, and the privilege of the States consisted principally in determining the method in which it should be assessed. The King was said to *demand* a tax of the *Pays d'états*, and to *impose* it on the *Pays d'élection*.

This state of things was attended with great inconvenience and many evils. One of the most striking of these was the enormous difference which prevailed, perhaps in contiguous provinces, in the duties on the same article, and consequently in its price. In

some provinces, for instance, as Bretagne and the Artois, there was no *gabelle* or salt tax, while in others it was oppressive. In the free provinces salt was worth only from two to eight livres the quintal, while in those subject to the *grande gabelle* it sold for sixty-two livres. The Crown alone enjoyed the right to sell salt, and in the provinces subject to the *gabelle* its consumption was obligatory; every person above seven years of age was compelled to purchase seven pounds annually at the *Grenier du Roi*.[1] A cask of wine passing from the Orléanais into Normandy increased at least twentyfold in price, while goods from China could be imported at only five times their original cost. The taxes were chiefly assessed on the most necessary articles of life, such as bread, salt, meat, and wine; so that the burden was thrown chiefly on the poor. Salt alone contributed fifty-four million livres to the revenue. The great difference in the duties on the same articles in different provinces made the same precautions necessary to prevent smuggling between them as if they had been foreign countries, and an army of 50,000 men was employed to guard 1,200 leagues of internal barriers. It was estimated that smuggling and the illicit manufacture of salt occasioned annually 4,000 domiciliary visits, 3,400 imprisonments, and 500 convictions, some of which were capital.[2] In years of scarcity these barriers produced the greatest inconvenience and distress by preventing the ready transit of grain from one district to another. The independent fiscal system of the provinces also rendered possible to persons in authority that peculation to which we have already alluded in the instance in which Louis XV. himself was implicated in 1771, and which was consigned to infamy under the name of the *Pacte de famine*.[3] One province was ignorant of the condition of another; the total amount of direct taxation was known only by the King's council. The *fermiers généraux* or *traitants*, to whom the taxes were farmed, treated France like a conquered country. The galleys, the prisons, the gallows were at their service. No man could tell the amount of their gains. But out of them they had to make large presents to courtiers and mistresses. Even the King himself, when they closed their accounts, condescended to receive from them large sums of gold in velvet purses.[4] And

[1] Necker, *Administration des Finances*, t. ii. p. 12 sq.

[2] *Ordonnance des Gabelles*, 1680, tit. vi. ap. Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Franç.* t. i. p. 506; Necker, *Ibid.* t. i. ch. viii.; *Mém. de Calonne aux Notables*, No. viii.; Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. i. p. 183.

[3] See above, p. 268.

[4] Monteil, *Hist. des Français*, t. x.; *Décade des onze soupers*, ap. Blanc, liv. iii. ch. iii.

not unfrequently the arm of the law or the strong hand of power compelled them to disgorge their ill-gotten wealth.

These very anomalies, however, created a necessity for a strong central government. It was by this method that Richelieu obviated, or, at least, palliated, the inconveniences which it lay not in his power to remove. Under his Ministry, all France was divided, for fiscal and administrative purposes, into thirty-two districts called *généralités*, each under the superintendence of an *Intendant*, who was commonly selected from the *maîtres des requêtes* attached to the Royal Council. His functions were to superintend the construction and maintenance of high roads, bridges, &c.; to control hospitals, prisons, and the relief of the poor; to take care that taxes were equitably assessed, and justice impartially administered; to direct the police, with other duties of the like kind. The *Intendants* in central France were dependent on the Controller of Finance, those in the frontier provinces on the Secretary at War. Thus the whole Kingdom was subjected to the surveillance of the King and his Ministers; and the despotism of the Crown was brought home to the very doors of the people. Law bade d'Argenson observe that France was entirely governed by some thirty *Intendants*, the clerks of the provinces, on whom depended their happiness or misery, their sterility or abundance.[1] Thus also a system of centralization was established which materially contributed to render Paris the censorium, as it were, of France—a result, of which the disastrous effects upon the Revolution will claim our attention in the sequel.

All the miseries and abuses we have described had been endured without inquiry or complaint till about the middle of the eighteenth century, when a school of writers sprang up which began to attack them from the administrative point of view.[2]

One of the first, and perhaps the most distinguished of this kind of reformers was the Marquis d'Argenson, Minister for Foreign Affairs in 1744, and previously *Intendant* of Hainault. His treatise entitled *Considérations sur le Gouvernement de France*, published in 1740, and consequently several years before the appearance of the *Encyclopédie*, contains many liberal principles. He was for doing away with the invidious fiscal privileges of the nobles, abolishing Protestant disabilities, and making all alike admissible to public office. But his scheme presents no bold and striking outline. The main feature of it was to divide France

[1] Taine, *Anc. Régime*, p. 320. [2] Voltaire, *Dict. Philosophique*, article *Blé*.

by degrees into new departments and *arrondissemens*, which were all to be endowed with an administration resembling that of the *Pays d'états*. Thus there was to be a municipal council in each parish; an assembly in each district composed of deputies from the different parishes, and the States of the province or department, formed of deputies from the districts. But these bodies were to be intrusted only with the administration of their local concerns. They were to have no voice in the general affairs of the Kingdom, nor could anything be submitted to them that had not first been sanctioned by the King. In a word, he would have created a multitude of little provincial democracies under a central despotism.

With the administrative reformers arose the *Physiocrats* and the *Economists*. *Physiocracy*, or the government of nature, derived its name from the fundamental tenet of the sect, that the soil alone was the source of all wealth, its cultivators the only productive class, the rest of the world was designated as *classe stérile*. Quesnay, physician to Madame de Pompadour, was the founder of this sect. They denounced such institutions as stood in the way of their theories; but they had no wish to diminish the absolute power of the Crown; on the contrary, they considered it essential to their purposes, and better adapted to them than English liberty. We are not, therefore, surprised to find that some of them felt an extraordinary admiration for China; where an absolute, yet unprejudiced Sovereign cultivated the earth once a year with his own hands, in honour of the useful arts; where all places were obtained by literary competition; where philosophy took the place of religion, and learning was a title to aristocracy.[1] Some of the physiocrats held a sort of socialist doctrine, as Morelly, who, in his *Code de la Nature*, published in 1754, advocated the community of goods. This school made a great parade of analysis and philosophical method, though their main theory was not a very wise one. The earth, as the sole source of all wealth, was to bear the whole burden of taxation; and hence their grand aim was to augment the net product of the land, in other words, the income of the landed proprietor; and bread was to be made dear in order that agriculture might flourish! It was to ridicule this school that Voltaire wrote his *Homme aux 40 écus*.

Side by side with this school grew up another, that of the *Economists*, whose attention was directed to commerce. Opposed

[1] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 249.

on other points to the views of the *Physiocrats*, they held one doctrine in common with them—the removal of all restrictions. The mottoes common to both schools were *laissez faire, laissez passer*. The Marquis of Mirabeau, father of the orator, belonged to the Economists, and was among the first advocates of free trade, especially in corn. In a passage of his *Ami des Hommes*,[1] he asks: "In order to maintain abundance in a Kingdom, what should be done?—Nothing." Thus he opened the road, though often erroneously and inadequately, which was afterwards improved and completed by Adam Smith. The virtuous Turgot, whose constant aim was the good of the people, was the most eminent member of this school. The views of Turgot embraced the abolishment of *corvées* and *jurandes*, the suppression of provincial barriers and custom-houses, the establishment of a free-trade in corn, and the compelling the nobles and clergy to contribute to the taxes. It was Turgot who first asserted, in his article *Fondation* in the *Encyclopédie*, that church lands were national property.

It was not, however, such gradual and incomplete reforms, even if these could have been carried without some convulsion, that could satisfy the present temper of the French nation. Instead of lopping off a few abuses of the ancient *régime*, a spirit was abroad which was to overthrow both the throne and the altar, and to shake society to its foundations. This spirit had been engendered by the literature and pseudo-philosophy of the eighteenth century. The material progress of the middle-classes, accompanied with a corresponding advance in their manners and education, had produced an apt and ready audience for its doctrines. The citizen had become as enlightened as the noble in the philosophy and literature which then prevailed; for Paris was the common source whence all derived their lights, and had impressed upon all a nearly uniform way of thinking. Into the effects of this new philosophy we must now inquire.

The French literature of the seventeenth century, formed under the auspices of Richelieu, Mazarin, and Louis XIV., had been developed in the spirit of the anti-reformation, and rested on classical antiquity, the Roman Catholic religion, and absolute Monarchy. It had been encouraged by Richelieu and his successors as a means of extending their own as well as the national glory; nor can it be denied that it had a vast effect in promoting French influence abroad. Richelieu, however, seems to have felt

[1] Tom. iii. *Commerce étranger*, p. 40.

some apprehension of the consequences it might one day produce at home. In a remarkable passage of his *Testament Politique*, he almost foretells the spirit of the eighteenth century, and betrays his anxiety to prevent the diffusion of knowledge among the vulgar; unconscious that its floodgates, when once opened, cannot again be closed.[1] Already before the end of the seventeenth century symptoms had begun to appear of a change in the literary taste of the nation. The almost superstitious reverence for classical antiquity was the first idol to be destroyed, and Perrault's attack on the ancients was the harbinger of a new era. The French writers of the eighteenth century sought their inspiration not in classical, but in modern literature, especially the English. After this school, they began to occupy themselves with questions of politics and religion; to discuss the elementary principles of society as they may be discovered by the light of reason and the law of nature; and to investigate the grounds of religious belief. Thus the age of Bossuet and Pascal was succeeded by that of Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopædists.

Infidelity had, indeed, taken root in France before the close of Louis XIV.'s reign, under the auspices of the profligate Duke of Vendôme and his brother; and it was in this school that the Duke de Chartres, afterwards the Regent Orleans, imbibed his principles of atheism and immorality. It is the nature of extremes to produce their opposites; and there can be little doubt that disgust at the bigotry, superstition, and hypocrisy which marked the later years of Louis XIV., contributed to produce this deplorable reaction. Infidelity, however, would not probably have spread itself among the great mass of the nation, but for the writers who subsequently sprung up. Fontenelle was their precursor, whose long life, extending from the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, rendered him the connecting link between the literature of the two periods. Not that Fontenelle can be exactly styled an infidel author. He was, as M. Villemain remarks, but the discreet echo of the bolder thinkers, such as Bayle and others, who wrote in Holland. Yet his writings are marked by a certain want of orthodoxy, a disposition to question received opinions, and to treat grave subjects in that tone of *badinage* which became characteristic of the eighteenth century. Such especially is the style of his *Histoire*

[1] "Si les lettres étoient profanées à toutes sortes d'esprits, on verrait plus de gens capables de former des doutes que de les résoudre, et beaucoup seraient plus propres à s'opposer aux vérités qu'à les défendre." Ch. ii. § 10.

des Oracles, while his *Dialogues of the Dead* betray a genius kindred with that of Lucian.

Lord Bolingbroke, and the Club of the Entre-sol, which he founded during his banishment in France, tended greatly to promote the liberalism and infidelity of the eighteenth century, and to give them a literary and philosophical turn. Among the most remarkable members of the Club of the Entre-sol, was the Abbé de St. Pierre, whose works, says M. Villemain,[1] present the programme of a social revolution so bold and complete as to astonish even J. J. Rousseau. But Montesquieu must perhaps be regarded as the first writer whose works had any direct influence upon the French Revolution. After travelling over great part of Europe Montesquieu took up his abode in England, in 1729. Here he applied himself to the study of our Constitution, for which he imbibed a great admiration, as appears from his panegyric on it in the eleventh book of his *Esprit des Lois,* published about twenty years afterwards. At first, however, this, his greatest work, was not understood by his countrymen. They were hardly yet ripe for serious political studies, and Montesquieu's first work, the *Lettres Persanes,* seems to have given them a wrong idea of his genius. In the disguise of Eastern masquerade Montesquieu in that work aimed some sly blows at French customs and institutions; and hence, while uttering in the *Esprit des Lois* his earnest convictions, he was still regarded by many of his countrymen only as a concealed satirist. His book was much better received in England, and it was only by Frenchmen of the next generation that it began to be duly understood and appreciated.

Montesquieu must be regarded as the father of that school of reformers, including Necker, Lally Tollendal, Mounier, and others, who at the commencement of the French Revolution wished to establish in France a Constitution on the English model. Hence, in the vain pursuit of institutions, which, it may be confidently asserted, would never have suited the genius and habits of the French nation, they were led to assist the beginnings of a movement which it was not afterwards in their power to stop. There was no analogy whatever between the France of 1789 and England at any period of its history. The want of an aristocracy influential through its dignities and wealth, yet without particular privileges, except that of an hereditary peerage, and identified in its private interests with the great mass of the people, would alone

[1] *Tableaux des Litt. Franç.*, Partie ii. Leçon xiv.

have rendered English institutions impossible in France. The democratic inclinations of the French, their military habits, their large standing army, all tended the same way. The principles of Montesquieu obtained however, at length, a sort of triumph in the Charter of 1814; which appears to have been founded on the scheme of a Constitution modelled on that of England, and submitted by Lally Tollendal to the Constituent Assembly.[1]

Voltaire, who also acquired much of his philosophy in England, had a far greater influence than Montesquieu on the French Revolution. Not, however, from any love of constitutional liberty. Voltaire throughout his life was an aristocrat and a royalist, *quand même*. The son of a notary, he drops the paternal name of Arouet, assumes the title of Mons. de Voltaire, and mixes in the highest circles of Paris. And what society might not have been proud of him? what circle would not have been adorned by his wit and genius? Unfortunately, however, his talent for satire produced effects calculated to remind him unpleasantly of his plebeian origin. He offended a young nobleman, the Chevalier de Rohan, who caused him to be horse-whipped, and in reply to a demand for satisfaction, obtained a *lettre de cachet* which consigned him to the Bastille, whence he was released only to be banished into England. Here was enough to have cured most men of a love of aristocracy and despotism. Not so with Voltaire. On his return we find him throwing himself at the feet of Madame de Pompadour, nay, of Madame du Barri; courting Louis XV. by every means in his power; degrading his fine genius by representing that vicious and profligate Monarch under the character of Trajan in a little piece entitled *Le Temple de Gloire*,[2] which he wrote for the theatre of Versailles; meanly thrusting himself in the King's way after the performance, to catch the smile and the approving word that were to reward him; and when repulsed with the most marked disdain, for Louis liked neither his principles nor person, still retaining all the devotion of loyalty. Thus, as late as 1771, during the quarrel between Louis XV. and his Parliaments, we find him writing, "For my part, I think the King is right; and if we must serve, it is better to serve under a lion of a good house than under two hundred rats of my own kind." He showed the same complacency towards foreign potentates. Failing to attract the notice of his own Court, he became the guest and literary satellite of Frederick II. of Prussia; and though ultimately treated with the grossest indignity and insult by that Monarch, condescended to

[1] See L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 64.

[2] See Marmontel, *Mémoires*.

congratulate him on his victory at Rossbach. He approved of Catharine II.'s arbitrary designs against the national existence of Poland and Turkey.[1] Nay, we even find him corresponding with that Sovereign on the shameful and secret events of her private life, and venturing to bestow upon her the name of Semiramis; whilst the Empress, so far from being offended at the equivocal compliment, tells him "that the eldest of the Orloffs has the soul of a Roman, that he is worthy of the best times of that Republic."[2]

How, then, did Voltaire contribute to the Revolution? Principally by his attacks on the established religion. Between the Church, almost invariably the upholder of the existing state of things, and a tyranny which founds itself on Divine right, the connection is so close that one cannot be shaken without endangering the other. The sceptical nature of Voltaire's writings had, moreover, a natural tendency to sap belief in all fixed principles whatsoever. The overthrow of the Church, the absorption of ecclesiastical property, the proclamation of the Age of Reason, are among the most marked and striking features of the French Revolution; and they must be ascribed in the main to the teaching of Voltaire.

Voltaire's scepticism, if not imbibed, was at least confirmed, by his residence in England. His study of the English deistical writers, as Shaftesbury, Toland, and others, and his friendship and intercourse with Lord Bolingbroke, gave it a body and a method. From the study of Locke's metaphysical works he imbibed the theory of Sensation; a doctrine which was afterwards developed in France by Condillac in his *Traité des Sensations*, and laid the foundation of the materialism of the French Encyclopædists. Voltaire's residence in England, during which he obtained a very considerable mastery of our language, imbued him with much admiration for our literature and customs. Hence he contributed to spread in France what has been called the *Anglomania*; which, by promoting travelling in England, the studying of the English language, the reading of English newspapers, and even the affecting of English tastes and manners, undoubtedly became a strong predisposing cause of the Revolution.[3]

It was natural that on his return to France Voltaire should be struck with the different state of things that he found there. Having studied in England the philosophy of Newton, he drew

[1] See his letters of January 1st and November 2nd, 1772.

[2] Villemain, *Œuvres*, t. ix. p. 356.

[3] Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 37 sq.

up his *Système du Monde* to explain it to his countrymen; but the chancellor d'Aguesseau refused his *visa* to the publication. Such was the narrow spirit which then prevailed among the French authorities, and especially in the Church! All new ideas were looked upon as dangerous, even the most certain and demonstrable conclusions of science. Cardinal Polignac, a fashionable Latin poet of that day, had denounced Newton's discovery in his *Anti-Lucretius*, as a dangerous reminiscence of Democritus and Epicurus![1] Still worse was the fate of Voltaire's *Lettres Philosophiques sur les Anglais*, which he published soon after his return to France, and which contained much praise of our customs and institutions. The Parliament of Paris ordered them to be burnt by the common hangman, and deprived the publisher of his *maîtrise*. Voltaire afterwards recast them in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique*.

Such treatment was not likely to increase Voltaire's respect for the Church. And, indeed, there was much in its practice that might serve to explain, and to a certain extent to justify, the hostility of an observant philosopher. The higher clergy were often open profligates and atheists; while that portion, including the Jansenists, which pretended to devotion, exhibited little more than an anile superstition united with a bloody persecuting spirit. What should be thought of a Church in which the profligate Abbé Dubois could obtain a Cardinal's hat, as well as the Archbishopric of Cambray, the see of the virtuous Fénelon? And could find two bishops, one the illustrious Massillon, to vouch for his orthodoxy and worthiness? Prelates of high rank lived in open adultery and fornication; as Cardinal Montmorenci, Grand Almoner of France, with Madame de Choiseul, an abbess. The Bernardine monks of Granselve, in the department of Gers, celebrated their patron's fête with orgies that lasted a fortnight, to which women were admitted, and in which all sorts of excesses were perpetrated.[2] These scandalous scenes were diversified not only with the ridiculous disputes about the *billets de confession*, the exhibitions of the convulsionaries, &c., already related, but also with cruel and revolting persecutions. In February, 1762, in pursuance of a sentence of the Parliament of Toulouse, Rochette, a Protestant pastor, was hanged for having exercised his ministry in Languedoc. Soon after, Calas, another Protestant of Toulouse, was broken on the wheel on the false accusation of having killed

[1] Villemain, pt. i. leç. i.

[2] See the account of the Abbé Montgaillard, an eye-witness, in his *Hist. de France*, t. ii. p. 246.

his son in order to prevent his turning Catholic. Voltaire protected Calas's widow and children, who had themselves been subjected to torture; and by bold and persevering efforts vindicated the memory of Calas and obtained an indemnification for his family, by procuring a revision and reversal of his sentence. At a later period he interfered, but with less success, for another victim of clerical fury. In 1766 two young officers, La Barre and D'Etallonde, were prosecuted by the Bishop of Amiens for mutilating a crucifix erected on a bridge at Abbeville. D'Etallonde escaped by flight; La Barre was convicted on very vague testimony, and sentenced by the Jansenist Court of Abbeville to have his hand and tongue amputated, and to be burnt alive. The Parliament of Paris, on appeal, confirmed the sentence in spite of all Voltaire's efforts; according, however, to the criminal the favour of being beheaded instead of being burnt.[1] If such scenes were calculated to excite the indignation of a philosophic observer, the intellectual state of the Church might inspire him with contempt. Its glories had been extinguished with Bossuet and the eminent prelates of the age of Louis XIV.; since which period its intellect had sunk in an inverse ratio to the growing enlightenment of the age.

Hence the Church, like the other institutions of France, contributed to its own destruction. Unhappily, however, the opposition which it engendered, not content with attacking the Church alone, aimed at upsetting Christianity itself; just as the Monarchy perished in the attacks directed against its abuses. But for these results the authors and abettors of these abuses are mainly responsible. Revolutions act by extremes, just as the overstrained bow regains not its equilibrium till it has been equally distorted in an opposite direction.

The popular form in which Voltaire disseminated his principles procured for them a ready and extensive circulation. In England the attacks upon religion were made in a learned and didactic manner, and hence they were little read except by the higher and more educated classes, while the popular literature was rather of a religious cast. Voltaire's attacks were often insinuated in a novel or a poem, and being indirect were perhaps the more effective. The stealthy blow finds us unguarded, and our self-love is flattered by being left to apply a covert insinuation. The *Pucelle* was calculated to degrade at once the national and the religious traditions of France. In the *Henriade* a higher subject

[1] See Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 140 sq.

is treated in a more elevated tone; but the apotheosis of Henry IV. implies the condemnation of Louis XIV., and the praises of the author of the Edict of Nantes are a concealed satire on its abolisher. Voltaire first made history entertaining, released it from its pedantic fetters, and communicated to it graces hitherto deemed incompatible with the gravity proper to its style. At the same time he made it subservient to his attacks upon the Church. Adopting in his *Essai sur les Mœurs* the exactly contrary principle to that followed by Bossuet in his *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, Voltaire attributed all the misfortunes of the Middle Ages to Christianity and the faults and errors of the clergy. By his tone of mockery, as an eminent critic has remarked,[1] Voltaire altered the truth of history, and failed in the very object which he chiefly professed, an impartial judgment of the different historical epochs. The same writer observes that Voltaire is not so incorrect in his facts as is generally represented. His chief fault is that he substitutes caricature for a true picture of the human mind. His *Siècle de Louis XIV.* is less marked with this defect, and is in every way his best and most trustworthy historical production. At a later period he assailed religion in a more direct and formal manner in his *Philosophical Dictionary*, but not perhaps with such popular success.

Voltaire's wit, vivacity, and admirable style made him the most popular of authors. No writer, perhaps, has exercised a greater and more general influence on his age. It was not in France alone that he was regarded as the Apostle of Reason, and the harbinger of a new era. Many of the sovereigns and statesmen of Europe, Frederick the Great of Prussia, Catharine II. of Russia, Joseph II. of Austria, were among his admirers and correspondents. He even exchanged compliments with Pope Benedict XIV. about his tragedy of *Mahomet;* and Cardinal Quirini amused himself with translating the *Henriade* into Latin verse. It was through Voltaire's inspiration that D'Aranda in Spain, Pombal in Portugal, were led to expel the Jesuits. Pombal caused the works of Voltaire and Diderot to be translated into the Portuguese language. Thus through the medium of England, the spirit of the Reformation, degenerating into scepticism, reoperated through the genius of Voltaire upon the most bigoted nations of Europe.

Sarcasm and ridicule were Voltaire's great weapons, and to an institution like the French Church of that day none could have

[1] Villemain, leç. xvi.

been more dangerous. No man ever had a keener eye for absurdity and hypocrisy, nor a keener relish in exposing them. His mind, nevertheless, was endowed with some poetical fervour, and hence he recoiled from the cold and repulsive doctrine of materialism, and from the philosophy of the Encyclopædists. Voltaire believed in a Deity; and what man had more cause than he to think that his soul, the source of so many brilliant emanations, was something more than a product of brute matter? He may even be suspected of a lingering affection for the Church which he had reviled. It is at least certain that in his last visit to Paris, he was induced during a dangerous illness to receive the sacrament;[1] and that he helped to erect a church near his château at Ferney.

The philosophical school known as the Encyclopædists, who outran their master Voltaire, were the contemporaries of his later years. D'Holbach, a rich German baron, was their Mæcenas. D'Holbach had himself some literary pretensions, and was the author of the *Système de la Nature*, the most complete code of atheism that had yet appeared. D'Holbach gave the philosophers two dinners a week for a period of forty years; whence the Abbé Galliani called him the *Maître d'Hôtel de la Philosophie*. His table was frequented by Diderot, D'Alembert, Helvétius, Grimm, Raynal, and other *beaux esprits* of the day. Most of these were contributors to the famous *Encyclopédie*, whence the school derived their name. This storehouse of knowledge, projected by Diderot in 1750, was the first work of the kind, and was intended also to be a vehicle for the propagation of liberal opinions. Diderot's chief assistant was D'Alembert, a man of great mathematical attainments; who was intrusted with the writing of the preface, intended to throw a veil over the principles advocated in the work. From this school also proceeded many separate works aimed against the Church and the Monarchy. Of all its members Diderot had the most original genius; several of his works, which take a wide range from philosophy to comedy and romance, have considerable merit; but he was desultory in his studies, and deficient in that application by which alone great things can be produced. Among the works of his associates the best known are Helvétius's treatise *De l'homme*, a poor production, borrowed from the thoughts of his predecessors and contemporaries; and the Abbé Raynal's *Histoire des établissemens des Européens dans les deux Indes*. In this last, in many respects valuable

[1] Condorcet, *Vie de Voltaire*, *Œuvres*, t. i. p. 294; Grimm, *Correspondance*, &c. t. x. p. 22.

work, Raynal contrived to insert denunciations against kings which seem hardly to belong to his subject. Some of the chapters are said to have been written by Diderot. Raynal was ultimately bought by the Court, and wrote, in 1791, a censure of the Revolution.[1]

Among the guests at D'Holbach's table by far the most remarkable was Jean Jacques Rousseau. He did not, however, long remain a member of that brilliant society. Naturally of an unsocial disposition, Rousseau seems to have felt ill at ease among men whose position in life was superior to his own, and who had established a literary reputation to which, though already past middle life, he was only beginning to aspire. Marmontel, who was also one of D'Holbach's guests, has left us a picture of Rousseau at this period, "before he had become savage." "Nobody," he says, "better observed the dreary maxim to live with his friends as if they were one day to become his enemies. Yet, as his delicate and irritable self-love was well known, he was treated with the same attentions as would have been bestowed on a pretty but vain and capricious woman, whom one might desire to please."[2] It may be, also, that his disapproval of the tenets of those philosophers, which at all events formed a strong contrast to his own, was among his motives for withdrawing into solitude.

The consciousness of brilliant intellect led Rousseau to regard with disgust the cynical materialism of the Encyclopædists, which, like the Darwinism of our own times, degraded man to a level with the beasts. What! Should the only being which could observe and understand the phenomena of nature, study other beings and their relations, be sensible of order, beauty, virtue, and from contemplating the works of the creation could rise to the Creator, love what was good and act accordingly, be nothing but a brute![3] The man who could feel and reason thus had in him the seeds at least of nobleness and virtue, though partly from his peculiar temperament, partly from the circumstances of his life, they produced only abortive fruits. Endowed with an exquisite sensibility, bordering on, if it did not sometimes actually reach, insanity, Jean Jacques had some real, and many imaginary, grievances to allege against society. From childhood his life had been an almost constant struggle with adversity; he was often in positions which he felt to be unworthy of his genius,

[1] Montgaillard, *Hist. de France*, t. ii. p. 329. That writer had seen Raynal's receipt for 24,000 francs.

[2] Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 327 sq.

[3] See the *Confession de foi d'un vicaire Savoyard*.

and he sometimes descended to acts which must have made him despise himself. When a little prosperity at length dawned upon him he found himself, from innate shyness and early habits, incapable of playing a becoming part in society, and thus his irritable pride sustained a thousand wounds. So constituted, it is not surprising that he should have conceived a deadly hatred against the whole social system. His thoughts reverted to man in his unsophisticated state and to an ideal primitive society, which existed only in his own imagination. Of this imaginary world, and of the actual world with which it was contrasted, he wrote with burning thoughts, and with an eloquence and purity of style never excelled in French prose. He appealed to the feeling rather than, like Voltaire and the Encyclopædists, to the reason, and in times of ferment sentiment touches the heart, which argument leaves unmoved. When he reasoned, indeed, as he generally started from false premisses, he fell into contradictions and absurdities, though the flaws were concealed by a show of rigorous logical deduction highly captivating to his French readers. Among those readers, how many thousands were there who had the same quarrel with society as Rousseau himself, and now saw their secret feelings so admirably expressed! Especially he captivated the women, who had an immense influence on the Revolution. As his theories tended to the complete demolition of the existing order of things, and the reconstruction of society from its foundations, they coincided in a great degree with the actual situation; for, as we have before observed, there was no means of reforming the State, no method left but a thorough revolution.

As a writer on social and political science Rousseau's views are glaringly inconsistent. It is well known that he established his literary reputation by his answers to two theses proposed by the Academy of Dijon for prize essays. The first subject was: "Whether the progress of Literature and Art has contributed to purify or to corrupt manners?" the second, "What is the origin of the inequality among mankind? and is it authorized by the law of nature?" In his answers to these questions Rousseau maintained that letters and the arts are a source of corruption; that civil society is an unnatural state of existence; that the development of the higher faculties is prejudicial to mankind; that a rude, contented sort of animal life, without any care for mental culture, is the proper and normal condition of man, and that every deviation from it is degeneracy. From this view it follows, that the institution of property, the source of inequality, was a

crime, because property is a necessary condition of that abnormal state called civilized life. "The first man who, having enclosed a piece of land, undertook to say—this belongs to me, and found people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society." But in the *Contrat Social* the very basis of these earlier publications is entirely thrown aside. Instead of rejecting civil society, the *Social Contract* is an elaborate attempt to construct a system of it; and the right of property is expressly recognized in the problem whose resolution is proposed as the foundation of his system. "To find a form of association which shall defend and protect with all the force of the community the person *and the property* of each associate; and by which each, uniting himself to all, shall nevertheless obey only himself, and remain as free as he was before."[1]

Rousseau, then, was not always consistent—was he always sincere? This point has been a subject of much dispute. He himself represents the paradoxes of his first essay as the offspring of a sudden inspiration.[2] Diderot, however, used to relate that, when a prisoner at Vincennes, Rousseau, who often visited him there, mentioned one day his intention of competing for the prize of the Dijon Academy, and being asked which side he meant to take, replied that he should maintain the affirmative of the question; that is, the purifying effect of literature. "It is the ass's bridge," observed Diderot; "all the mediocre talents will take that road, which affords only commonplace ideas; while the opposite side presents a new and fertile field of philosophy and eloquence." After a moment's reflection Rousseau assented, and said that he would adopt the advice."[3] The truth of this anecdote has been disputed by some eminent writers, from whose opinion we venture to differ only with the greatest diffidence,[4] and it is true enough that, from Rousseau's cast of mind, the more paradoxical view might easily have been original. The evidence of Diderot, is, however, confirmed by that of Hume. Burke, in his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, says: "Mr. Hume told me that he had from Rousseau himself the secret of his principles of composition. That acute, though eccentric, observer had perceived that to strike and interest the public, the marvellous must

[1] "Trouver une forme d'association qui défende et protège de toute la force commune la personne et les biens de chaque associé, et par laquelle chacun, s'unissant à tous, n'obéisse pourtant qu'à lui-même, et reste aussi libre qu'auparavant."—*Contrat Social*, liv. i. chap. vi.

[2] See his *Confessions*, liv. viii.

[3] Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. ii. p. 40.

[4] See Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 67 note; Villemain, *Tableau*, &c. t. ii. leçon xxiv.

be produced; that the marvellous of the heathen mythology had long since lost its effect—that it was necessary to resort to the marvellous in life, manners, character, and situation."

Sincere or not, however, Rousseau was indisputably inconsistent. Yet many of the French democrats, and even some writers of the present day, have confounded together all his principles, as if they formed part of some great philosophical whole. The socialist doctrines of property in common, of fraternity as opposed to what M. L. Blanc calls *individualism*, must be sought in Rousseau's earlier works; they form no part of his *Social Contract*.[1] This last, his most practical work, and on which his fame as a political philosopher must rest, was, perhaps, partly founded on hints derived from the Republican Constitution of his native city. It contains much that might be practicable—we do not say expedient—under certain conditions of society, and was so regarded not only by the French democrats, but also by the Corsicans and the Poles, who made Rousseau their legislator, and asked for a constitution at his hands. The assumption of an original contract as the basis of civil society had been made by less eccentric philosophers than Rousseau; it had been solemnly asserted by the practical English statesmen of 1688. Although a fiction, it afforded at least convenient grounds for inquiring into first principles. Even the chief characteristic doctrine of the *Social Contract*, the sovereignty of the people, had been promulgated by the Dutch in their Declaration of Independence, and had been maintained by Locke in his *Treatise on Government;* nor in so far that the last appeal in all questions affecting the vital interests of a nation should be to the people itself, will any enlightened mind be disposed to contest the doctrine. But the difference between Locke and Rousseau is this, that while both thought that the sovereign power resides inalienably in the people, Locke allows that it may be delegated; while Rousseau holds that the sovereign, that is, the people, can only be represented by himself.[2] Even this might not be impracticable in a small State, and was, indeed, actually done at Athens; but Rousseau is forced to admit its unsuitableness for a large one;[3] and hence his theory sinks at once from the rank of absolute to that of only relative

[1] See L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.* t. i. p. 535 and *passim*.

[2] "Je dis donc, que la souveraineté, n'étant que l'exercise de la volonté générale, ne peut jamais s'aliéner, et que le souverain, qui est un être collectif, ne peut être représenté que par lui-même."—*Contr. Soc.* liv. ii. chap. i.

[3] *Ibid.* liv. iii. chap. xv. Rousseau, however, had a plan for obviating this difficulty, which he intrusted to the Count d'Antraigues, afterwards a deputy in the Constituent Assembly, who, by the advice of a friend, destroyed the MS. as dangerous to royal authority. See *Œuvres de Rousseau*, t. v. p. 269 (ed. 1823).

truth. And, as we shall see in the course of the following narrative, the active assumption of the sovereignty by the French people, or rather by the people of Paris, during the Revolution, and their utter contempt for their representatives, gave birth to some of its most absurd and atrocious scenes. As a legitimate deduction from these views, Rousseau condemned representative government altogether. He recognized not such bodies as Parliaments and National Assemblies; for as the people cannot delegate the sovereignty, so neither can they delegate the legislative power, the highest function of the sovereign. Hence Rousseau was no admirer of the English Constitution. He even ridicules the English for thinking themselves free; a condition which, according to him, they enjoy only during the short period employed in electing members of Parliament.[1]

As Rousseau had been the advocate of a state of nature before he undertook to construct a civil society, the problem was to invent a scheme which, while it protected person and property, should leave a man as free as he was supposed to have been before, so that he should still obey only himself. Such a paradox could, of course, be supported only by the most transparent sophistry. The individual was always to obey the general will by making it his own, so that if he had maintained his private opinion, in opposition to it, he would, in fact, have given up his will, and lost his freedom![2] Let us see how this unanimous will was to be produced. The ideal Republic begins with proscribing all difference of opinion. Certain abstract principles, called "sentiments of sociability," must be assented to by every citizen, nay, must be subscribed as articles of religious faith! Those who decline to do so must leave the country, those who after subscription act contrary to these principles are to be punished with death.[3] Truly, a precious scheme of liberty, involving the confession that it is impossible to make men think alike, and, consequently, to will alike, without the use of violence. When some are banished, others killed, those left at home, or alive, may be of one mind. The very system of the Reign of Terror!

Nor is Rousseau more consistent and reasonable in his notions about *equality*, a doctrine which played so great a part in the Revolution. At the end of the first book of the *Social Contract* we

[1] *Contrat Soc.* liv. iii. chap. xv. Subsequently, however, he somewhat modified these views. Thus, in the *Considérations sur le Gouvernement de la Pologne*, chap. vii., he admits representative government. Cf. *Lettres de la Montagne.* But he thought that the English system required annual parliaments and universal suffrage.

[2] *Contrat. Soc.* liv. iv. chap. ii.

[3] *Ibid.* liv. iv. ch. viii.

read: "I shall conclude this chapter and book with a remark which should serve as the basis of the whole social system; it is, that the fundamental contract, instead of destroying *natural equality*, substitutes, on the contrary, a moral and lawful equality for whatever physical inequality nature may have established among men; and while they may be unequal in strength and genius, makes them all equal by convention and right." But, as it may be presumed that, in the supposed state of nature, men obey no law but their own will, and, as it is admitted that they are unequal in strength and genius, how should there be any *natural equality?* The end of civil society, then, is not to preserve natural equality, for there is none, but to remedy the want of it, so far as may be done. This, as Rousseau truly says, is effected by convention and right. The result, however, is not *equality* but *justice*. All that society can do is to make men equal *before the law*.

Another inconsistency in Rousseau is, that he has at bottom but a very mean opinion of the sovereign he has set up. He is, after all, unwilling to intrust the people with their highest prerogative—that of legislation—although he has before informed us that it cannot possibly be delegated. "How," he says, "can a blind multitude which often knows not what it wishes, since it rarely knows what is good for it, execute so great and difficult a task as a system of legislation?" Again: "But there are a thousand sorts of ideas which it is impossible to translate into the language of the people. Views too general, objects too remote, are alike beyond its reach; every individual relishing only that plan of government which concerns his private interest, perceives with difficulty the advantages which he may derive from the continual privations imposed by good laws," &c.[1] Hence Rousseau is compelled to appoint a legislator.

In like manner he considers an aristocracy to be the best form of government, or of the *executive power;* which we must not confound with the *sovereignty*. He even thinks, and perhaps he is right, that there can be no perfect popular government without slavery. "The Greek people," he observes, "lived in a mild climate; it was not avaricious; its work was done by slaves; its chief business was its liberty. Having no longer the same advantages, how shall we preserve the same rights? . . . What! can liberty only be maintained through servitude? Perhaps even so. The two extremes meet. . . . As for you, people of modern times,

[1] *Contrat Soc.* liv. ii. chs. vi. and vii.

you have no slaves, but you are slaves yourselves instead; you buy their liberty at the price of your own. It is in vain that you boast this preference; I see in it more of cowardice than humanity."[1] He deprecates, indeed, being considered as the advocate of slavery, though, after what he has said, we hardly see on what grounds. But the fact remains, that he thinks there can hardly be a good government without a certain aristocratic mixture; for what is a people, whose work is done for them by slaves, but an aristocratic people? The Athenian Republic is again an instance in point.

These few specimens may serve to show that Rousseau was not always consistent with himself, and it is certain that his doctrines were often misunderstood, exaggerated, and misapplied by his revolutionary disciples.[2] Yet no writer, as we have before remarked, had a greater influence on the Revolution. Before it broke out, Marat was accustomed to read and comment on the *Contrat Social* in the streets amid the applause of an enthusiastic audience. Professors of jurisprudence put it into the hands of their pupils as a manual.[3] The majority of the first National Assembly were Rousseau's disciples, as appears from their voting him a statue, as the author of the *Contrat Social*, the elementary book of public liberty and the science of government; and from their giving a pension of 1,200 francs to his widow.[4] They seem to have borrowed from Rousseau the idea of giving the King the title of "King of the French," instead of "King of France."[5] But the Declaration of the Rights of Man by the Constituent Assembly is perhaps the strongest instance of his influence. In the third Article his dogma of the sovereignty of the people is laid down in its full extent. As the Revolution pursued its headlong course, Rousseau's authority grew all the stronger. The first Declaration of Rights only proclaimed that men are equal *in rights;* the second (June 24th, 1793) asserted that they are equal *by nature.*[6] Thus the natural was sophistically confounded with the social state, the savage with the civilized man; and the people, instead of being instructed in their duties, were taught to believe themselves entitled to rights utterly incompatible with their social condition.

As Voltaire was the laughing philosopher, the Democritus of the Revolution, so Rousseau was its Heraclitus. Uniting an

[1] *Contr. Soc.* liv. iii. ch. xv.

[2] See to this effect the testimony of Bailleul, a member of the Convention, *Esprit de la Révol.* chap. vi.

[3] Taine, *Anc. Régime*, p. 415.

[4] Toulongeon, *Hist. de France, &c.* t. i. p. 266.

[5] See *Contrat Soc.* liv. i. chap. ix.

[6] See these Declarations in Toulongeon, t. i. App.

ardent imagination with extraordinary dialectic subtlety, he was enabled to support his extravagant hypotheses with a display of reasoning which to some minds made them appear truths. But we do not believe that he was the dupe of his own paradoxes. He threw them out as baits for the vulgar and unreflecting. He would perhaps have been filled with regret could he have foreseen their consequences, for he had the greatest aversion to violence. In one of his letters he observes: "In my opinion, the blood of one man alone is more precious than the liberty of the whole human race;"[1] where, however, his temperament led him to a wrong conclusion.

A morbid sensibility, like that of Rousseau, is, however, so far from being incompatible with the most atrocious cruelty that their union forms one of the strangest and most striking features of the French Revolution. M. Michelet has remarked that many of the terrorists "were men of an exalted and morbid sensibility;"[2] and he goes on to observe that artists—not, we suspect, of the highest order—and women were particularly subject to it. Thus Panis and Sergent, the bloodthirsty miscreants who took so active a part in the massacres of September, burst into tears because a Marseillese to whom they had refused ball-cartridges on August 10th, threatened to shoot himself.[3] Jourdan *Coup-tête*, who cut off the heads of the governors of the Bastille and of the *gardes du corps* at Versailles, and afterwards took a leading part in the atrocities at Avignon, was easily moved to tears, and would sometimes cry like a child.[4] The perpetrators of the September massacres were occasionally seized with a fit of frantic joy when one of their intended victims was acquitted, and, by "a strange reaction of sensibility," would shed tears and throw themselves into the arms of those whom a moment before they were about to slay.[5] The same sort of "sensibility" appears to have characterized Danton.[6] It has been remarked that the novels and other publications of the bloodiest period of the Revolution are full of the word *sensibility*. Fabre d'Eglantine even talked about "the sensibility of Marat." But this expression, as M. Michelet observes, will surprise nobody but those who confound sensibility with goodness. In fact this sort of feeling is so little connected

[1] Lettre à Madame * * *, September 7th, 1776.

[2] *Hist. de la Révol. Franç.* liv. ii. chap. ii.

[3] See Panis's speech in Buchez and Roux, *Hist. Parlementaire*, t. xix. p. 94.

[4] Michelet, t. iii. p. 295.

[5] *Ibid.* t. iv. p. 158.

[6] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.* t. viii. p. 97.

either with the head or heart that it might almost be displayed by a galvanized corpse.

In the absence of all public debate, literature was, under the old *régime*, the only channel of political discussion. The growing audacity of its tone had not escaped the attention of the Government. A Royal Declaration of 1757, in the very zenith of Voltaire's ascendant, condemns *to death* those who should write or print or disseminate anything hostile to religion or the established Government.[1] The censorship of the Press, however, which was in the hands of the clergy, was on the whole exercised with tolerable leniency, though often capriciously. Thus Rousseau's prize essay was left unnoticed, while his harmless *Emile* was condemned to be burnt by the executioner. In like manner the Sorbonne refused their *imprimatur* to Marmontel's innocuous *Bélisaire*, and extracted from it thirty-two propositions, which they published with their anathema as heretical, under the title of *Indiculus;* to which Turgot subjoined the epithet *ridiculus*. One of the propositions denounced was: "It is not by the light of the flaming pile that souls are to be enlightened;" whence Turgot drew the legitimate conclusion that, in the opinion of the Sorbonne, souls were to be so enlightened! Such were the clerical censors of those days.

A living French writer somewhat paradoxically maintains that the restrictions on literature were really effective, and that the *philosophers* had thus little or no influence in producing the Revolution. In corroboration of this view he asserts, on the authority of the Introduction to the *Moniteur*, that their works were to be found only in the libraries of the educated and rich.[2] But what more could be required? It is notorious that the Revolution was begun by the higher classes. Thus Marmontel tells us that among the nobles, a considerable number of enthusiasts (*têtes exaltées*), some from a spirit of liberty, others from calculating and ambitious views, were inclined towards the popular party.[3] Madame de Staël says that not only all the men, but also all the women, who had any influence upon opinion among the higher classes, were warm in favour of the national cause; that fashion, all powerful in France, ran in this direction; and that this state of things was the result of the whole century.[4]

The privileged classes adopted the same language as the *Tiers*

[1] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 100.
[2] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes de la Révol. Fr.* t. i. p. 51 sq.
[3] *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 104.
[4] *Considérations sur la Révol. Fr.* *Œuvres*, t. xii. p. 179.

état, and were disciples of the same philosophers. As early as 1762, women of fashion had taken from Rousseau the ominous name of *citoyenne*, as a pet appellation.[1] In like manner, among the clergy, the most pronounced scepticism was found in the hierarchy. The Grand Vicar would smile at a little blasphemous talk, the Bishop laughed outright, the Cardinal would contribute something of his own. We need hardly advert to the rapidity with which, in a country like France, opinion spreads from class to class. This circumstance had not escaped the notice of Voltaire,[2] who had remarked the rapid diffusion of the new principles. A traveller who had been long absent from France being asked on his return at the commencement of Louis XVI.'s reign what change he observed in the nation? replied: "None, except that what used to be the talk of the drawing-rooms is now repeated in the streets."[3]

The persecution which authors experienced from the Censorship was more vexatious than terrible, and calculated rather to excite than to deter. Hume even expressed to Diderot his opinion that French intolerance was more favourable to intellectual progress than the unlimited liberty of the Press enjoyed in England.[4] However this may be, it is certain, and may serve as another refutation of M. Granier de Cassagnac's theory, before mentioned, that the progress of public opinion in France had led acute observers to predict a revolution even so early as the middle of the eighteenth century. Lord Chesterfield, in a letter dated April 13th, 1752, adverting to the quarrel between Louis XV. and the Parliament of Paris, observes: "This I see, that before the end of this century, the trade of both king and priest will not be half so good a one as it has been. Du Clos, in his *Réflections*, hath observed, and very truly, 'qu'il y a un germe de raison qui commence à se developper en France.' A development that must prove fatal to regal and papal pretensions."[5]

While such was the progress of public opinion, the Monarchy had been gradually sinking into unpopularity, we might almost say into contempt. The French people, till towards the close of

[1] Taine, *Anc. Régime*. liv. iv. ch. ii. s. v. See the whole section.

[2] "La lumière s'est tellement répandue *de proche en proche*, qu'on éclatera à la première occasion," &c.—*Lettre* à M. Chauvelin, Avr. 22, 1764.

[3] De Barante, *Lit. Française au* 18ème *Siècle*, 312.

[4] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 233.

[5] See to the same effect another letter of December 25th, 1753. The French Revolution was also foretold by Leibnitz in his *New Essay on the Human Understanding*, B. iv. ch. xvi.; by Voltaire, in the letter to M. Chauvelin, already quoted; and by Rousseau in his *Emile*, t. ii. p. 99 (ed. Geneva, 1780).

Louis XIV.'s reign, had loved their kings with an affection bordering on idolatry. They looked up to them as their protectors against the aristocracy, and as the promoters of national glory, both in arms and letters. But this popularity began to wane with Louis XIV.'s good fortune, and the approach of that misery which his ambition had occasioned. The Regency of the Duke of Orleans was calculated to bring all government into contempt. Yet the loyalty of the French seemed to revive a little in the first part of Louis XV.'s reign, till his mean and abominable vices entirely extinguished it. The masses ordered by private individuals for the King's safety form a kind of barometer of his popularity. During his illness at Metz in 1744, they amounted to 6,000; after Damiens' attempt on his life in 1757 to 600; at his last illness in 1774 to 3.[1] Such was the natural fate of the lover of Madame Du Barri, of the hoary voluptuary of the *Parc aux Cerfs*, of the mean and avaricious speculator in the distress of his people. The King and the corn-dealer were for ever confounded, and consigned to everlasting infamy. Frequent scarcities constantly recalled the *Pacte de Famine*, till at length it resounded as the death-knell of the French Monarchy, when on the 6th of October, 1789, the populace led the Royal Family captive to Paris, with shouts that they were bringing the baker, his wife, and the little apprentice! Thus Louis XVI. inherited a Crown sullied by the vices of his predecessors, and became the innocent victim of faults that were not his own. The feebleness of his character, nay, even his very virtues, assisted the Revolution. Had he possessed more energy and decision, had he felt less reluctance to shed the blood of his subjects, he might probably have averted the excesses which marked his own end and that of the Monarchy. "It is frightful to think," says Mounier, "that with a less benevolent soul, another Prince might perhaps have found means to maintain his power."[2]

The aid which, against his better judgment, Louis XVI. was induced to lend to the American rebellion, must, no doubt, as we have had occasion to remark before, be reckoned among the causes of his fall; not only by aggravating the financial distress, but also, and more materially, from the support which the doctrines of the revolutionary philosophers derived from the establishment of the American Republic. While, as M. Tocqueville remarks,[3] the American rebellion was only a new and astonishing

[1] Taine, p. 413.

[2] *Recherches sur les Causes, &c.*

[3] *Anc. Régime*, p. 223.

fact to the rest of Europe, to the French people it rendered more sensible and striking things which they had meditated on already. The Americans seemed only to be executing what the French writers had conceived, and to be giving to their dreams all the substance of reality. The aid which the French Government lent to rebels appeared a sanction of revolt. Lafayette and other Frenchmen, who had taken a personal share in the American struggle, were among the foremost to promote the Revolution in France, and the enthusiastic feeling which the declaration of American Independence excited among the French, was perhaps heightened by the circumstance that it had been achieved at the expense of a rival nation. During the first tumults in Paris, the name of Washington was the principal watchword in the different sections.

Louis XVI. himself, in his speech on opening the States-General in 1789, attributed the financial pressure to the American war. Its cost was estimated at 1,194 million livres, or about 48 millions sterling; and so bad was the state of credit in France, that this money was borrowed at an average of about 10 per cent.[1] We cannot, however, regard the disordered state of the finances as much more than the *occasion* of the Revolution, by necessitating the convocation of the States-General. It was none of the essential *causes* of the outbreak. Preceding monarchs had triumphed over greater financial embarrassments; and had everything else in the State been sound, even a national bankruptcy might have been surmounted. In fact, though the *deficit* set the Revolution in motion, it occupied but little attention after the movement was once begun. The importance of the *deficit* as a revolutionary motive, arose not so much from its amount, as from the temper of the nation. The wide-spread discontent among the middling and lower classes forbade the imposition of any new taxes, while the higher orders were not inclined to relinquish their fiscal privileges. Calonne, though the Minister of the courtiers, was compelled to acknowledge that the only hope of safety lay in the reform of all that was vicious in the State. He proposed to abolish the exemption from taxation enjoyed by the clergy and nobles; to increase the product of the direct taxes by a more equal distribution of them, and that of the indirect taxes by releasing agriculture, commerce, and manufactures from their fetters by abolishing internal barriers and obsolete rights and privileges;

[1] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. i. p. 108 note.

in short, by adopting many of the plans of D'Argenson already mentioned, including the establishment of provincial councils. These plans he was unable to carry out, but from this time any Ministry but a reforming one became impossible. Thus Calonne's successor, besides adopting many of the financial schemes of that Minister, proposed to reform the whole administration of justice, both civil and criminal; busied himself with amending the system of education, and abolished Protestant disabilities. Necker, a Protestant and a Swiss, naturally carried his views still further. He counselled the admission of all citizens, without distinction, to public employments, the abolishment of *lettres de cachet*, and of the censorship of the Press; and at a later period he showed that he was not disinclined to alter and modify the Monarchy itself. These reforms seem substantial enough, and would perhaps have given France all that she required, short of a Constitution. But they involved an attack upon all the privileged classes and constituted powers; they threatened provincial administration, commercial customs, and the privileges not only of the clergy and nobles, but also of the *robe* or legal order, and, in some degree of the *bourgeoisie*. Hence they provoked the opposition of these classes; and it soon became evident that this opposition could be overcome only by assembling the States-General.

The cry for this assembly had indeed originated in the Parliament of Paris (July, 1787), but rather with the design of thwarting the Court than helping the people. The Parliament was popular, because it was the opponent of the Crown, and it consequently expected that the States would sanction all its pretensions. When it was restored to its functions in September, 1788, after its suspension for having opposed the judicial reforms of Brienne, it was fêted by the people with extravagant demonstrations of joy. But in a few days it lost all its popularity by enregistering the Royal declaration for the summoning of the States, with the clause that they should be convened and composed agreeably to the forms observed in 1614; a clause which frustrated the popular wish that the *tiers état* should be represented by deputies equal in number to both the other orders combined.

This last point, the doubling of the *tiers état*, was one of the most important immediate causes of the Revolution. It gave the movement a beginning. Necker's conduct in the matter, though perhaps only the result of a want of firmness, and of broad statesmanlike views, was so equivocal, that some have accused him of

premeditated treachery.[1] It will be recollected[2] that he caused the Notables to be summoned a second time, in order to decide this question; yet, though they refused their sanction to the measure, Necker persuaded the King to adopt it. To judge his conduct fairly, we must recollect the circumstances in which he was placed. Except that the Notables had vaguely allowed, on their second convocation, that the taxes should be borne by all Frenchmen, the privileged orders were obstinately opposed to all concession. Yet it was absolutely necessary to overcome this opposition; and the only method of doing so was to appeal to the people, and to give them a preponderating voice in the Assembly. But Necker's conduct was hardly straightforward. In a Report to the King on the subject, he pretended to think that the importance of the question was exaggerated, since by ancient custom the three estates were authorized to deliberate and vote separately, and thus the respective numbers of the different Chambers would be of no moment. Yet the very next sentence shows that he was at least contemplating the occasional union of the States in one Chamber, "for the examination of all such matters in which their interest is absolutely equal or alike."[3] Necker induced the Parliament, through D'Eprémesnil, to reverse, or rather to explain, their decree on this subject; and they declared, December 5th, that by "the forms of 1614," they meant only the summoning by bailliages and *sénéchaussés*; and they left the decision as to the number of the deputies to the wisdom of the King. But by this tardy recantation, though accompanied with a recommendation of other popular measures, they failed to regain the goodwill of the people, whilst they alienated the privileged orders. The doubling of the *tiers état* was announced in the Royal declaration entitled, *Résultat du Conseil du Roi tenu à Versailles*, December 27th, 1788.

The question with the Court was, how to tide over the present conjuncture, and to retain as much as possible of its former power. The question with the people was, how to obtain their due share in the government; in short, a Constitution. Necker's vacillating policy and attempts to compromise matters tended only to precipitate the crisis. In his speech on the opening of the Assembly, he suggested, in conformity with his Report to the King, that on certain occasions, at least, the three orders should deliberate and

[1] See Sallier, *Annales Françaises*, p. 269 sqq.; Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. ii. p. 385 sqq.

[2] Above, p. 295.

[3] Report in the *Introd. au Moniteur*, p. 500 sqq. ap. Martin, t. xvi. p. 621.

vote in common; but he adduced some arguments to dissuade them from adopting such a method as a general rule.[1] If they did not, indeed, deliberate in common on matters of finance, Necker would not have obtained his end, his object being to force the privileged orders to pay taxes. But, if he was loyal and sincere, it betrays a lamentable want of statesmanship and knowledge of human nature not to have perceived that the Commons, having once obtained a union of the Chambers, would never abandon it; and that such a union would necessarily lead to a revolution. Necker's character as a statesman cannot be cleared from this reproach except on the assumption that he foresaw and wilfully incurred the consequences of his policy. For ourselves, we are inclined to adopt the view of an historian of this period:[2] that Necker was in this conjuncture too much the mere Minister of Finance; that in his anxiety to fill up the *deficit*, he overlooked the fatal results with which his measures for that purpose might be attended; that he had conceived too high an opinion of the moderation of the people, and perhaps, it may be added, of his own ability to control and direct them. However this may be, it is certain that Necker's policy was one of the chief proximate causes of the Revolution, which was thus mainly owing to two natives of Geneva, one of whom supplied its ideas, and the other the means of putting them into execution. But the classes which suffered most from its effects brought their calamities on themselves by the tenacity with which they clung to their unjust, absurd, and antiquated privileges, and by the obstinacy with which they opposed even the most necessary and moderate reforms.

The Court must also share in the condemnation of the Minister. It could not have been ignorant of the state of public opinion. Five Princes of the blood, the Count d'Artois, the three Condés, and the Prince de Conti, in a memorial addressed to the King in December, 1788, had declared that a revolution was in progress.[3] The state of the public mind must also have been known from the various publications and pamphlets of the day, and especially from the *cahiers*, or papers of instructions, given by the electors to their deputies. The Court committed a fatal mistake in doing too much and too little. It awakened the just hopes of the people by allowing the *tiers état* to equal the numbers of the other two

[1] Toulongeon, t. i. App. p. 43 sqq.

[2] Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, ch. iii. § 144, ch. iv. § 10. Such also was the opinion of Capello, the Venetian ambassador at Paris at that period. See his report to the Venetian Senate in Darn (liv. xxxiv.), which contains an excellent view of the causes of the French Revolution.

[3] Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 619.

orders; and then attempted to frustrate these hopes by the Royal Session of June 23rd. At a later period, Necker, in his work on the Revolution, regretted that the union of the three orders had not been conceded with good grace and at once. It will, indeed, appear in the following narrative that the conduct of the Court throughout the Revolution was a series of blunders.

The centralization of all France in Paris, rendering it as it were the sensorium of the Kingdom, contributed much to the origin as well as to the peculiar character of the Revolution. Here sprung the ideas which gave it birth; here took place all the scenes which decided its course. From the very first moment the fate of the Revolution was in the hands of the Parisian mob, and of the demagogues who led it. The destruction of Reveillon's paper manufactory by the populace, during the election of deputies to the States, though too much stress has perhaps been laid upon it as a political movement,[1] showed at least what extensive elements of discontent and danger were lurking in Paris. No sooner was the National Assembly opened than the Parisian electors, having formed themselves into a permanent and illegal committee, began to dictate to it. The deputies were regarded as the mere servants and organs of the sovereign people, and were bullied and insulted by the mob that filled the tribunes; who, as Arthur Young tells us, interrupted the debates by clapping their hands, and other noisy expressions of approbation.[2] The right of petition began very early to be abused. Sometimes these petitions were only ludicrous and unseemly. During the Constituent Assembly they were chiefly of a sentimental character. Thus the Assembly heard "with admiration" the address of a citizen who had sent a nosegay composed of ears of corn mingled with pomegranates gathered by the hands of his spouse.[3] Under the Legislative Assembly the petitioners were often accompanied by a band, which played symphonies and marches. On the 20th of June, 1792, they danced several hours before the Assembly. Under the Convention, petitioners became still more extravagant and menacing. They obtained permission to sing popular songs and romances at the bar;[4] they often came armed; they dictated to the deputies in the most insolent manner, and sometimes

[1] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. i. p. 11.

[2] While the deputies were discussing the subject of constituting themselves into a National Assembly, a man rushed from the tribunes and collared Malouet for uttering some exclamations which he disapproved. Droz, ap. Michelet, t. i. p. 43.

[3] *Moniteur*, t. i. p. 336, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 442.

[4] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 343.

threatened their lives. When the party of the Gironde at length began to feel the intolerable tyranny of the mob which they had themselves used to promote their ends, they sought to protect themselves, and to secure the freedom of debate, by moving for a guard to be composed of provincials. The manner in which this project was denounced by the orator of the Paris Sections affords a good specimen of the later style of petitioning. "Proxies of the Sovereign," he exclaimed, "you see before you the deputies of the Sections of Paris. They are come to tell you eternal truths, to recall to you the principles which nature and reason have engraved upon the heart of every freeman. A proposition has been made to put you on a level with tyrants, by surrounding you with a separate guard, different from that which composes the public force. The Sections, after duly weighing the principles in which the sovereignty of the people resides, declare to you through us that they find the project odious, and dangerous in execution. . . . Far be from us all egotism. We are not defending here the interests of Paris, but those of the whole Republic. . . . People say Paris wants to isolate itself. Insulting calumny; absurd pretext! Paris has made the Revolution; Paris has given liberty to France; Paris will know how to maintain it!"[1]

Such was the self-constituted sovereign people of the Revolution—the dregs of a large and profligate city. How unlike the sovereign dreamt of by the Genevese philosopher! Nay, how unlike the great mass of the French nation, who were desirous only of a moderate social reform. "The labourer in the fields," says Marmontel,[2] "the artizan in the towns, the honest burgess engrossed by his trade, demanded only to be relieved, and had they been left alone, would have sent to the Assembly deputies as peaceable as themselves. But in the towns, and especially in Paris, there exists a class of men, who, though distinguished by their education, belong by birth to the people, make common cause with them, and, when their rights are in question, take up their interests, lend them their intelligence, and infect them with their passions. It was among this class that an innovating, bold, and contentious spirit had long been forming itself, and was every day acquiring more strength and influence."

But, while the ascendency of the Parisian rabble effected the speedy downfall of the Monarchy, it was also the principal cause of the failure of the Republic. The throne was no sooner overturned than its overthrowers, instead of consolidating the new

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 350 sq.

[2] *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 37 sq.

State, began among themselves a deadly struggle for power, a struggle of which the mob were still the arbiters. How this state of things soon found its natural termination in a military despotism will appear in the following narrative.

The character of the national representatives was another cause of the failure of the Revolution. From the want of all public life in France, they had no political experience. Their knowledge of politics rested entirely on theory and speculation; and thus, as M. Tocqueville observes,[1] they carried their literary habits into their proceedings. Hence a love of general theories, complete systems of legislation, exact but impracticable symmetry in the laws; a contempt for existing facts, and a taste for what was original, ingenious, and new; a desire to reconstruct the State after a uniform plan, instead of trying to amend the parts of it. To this political ignorance, or worse still, illusory knowledge, must be ascribed some of the greatest evils of the Revolution. Vague and undefined notions of liberty and equality produced the worst and most ridiculous excesses. As it was impossible to establish an equality by raising up the lower orders, it was determined to pull down the higher ones, and thus to reduce everything to a uniform low level. Polite manners were exchanged for the grossness of the least educated class. The rich dissembled their enjoyments, and hid their pride under a modest, not to say miserable exterior; even wit itself, as something above the vulgar level, was compelled to assume the *carmagnole* or dress of the people.[2] As the bounds of the liberty aimed at were undefined, so they were never thought to be attained; and the entering thus on an unknown course necessarily inflamed and exaggerated all passions and opinions. This is no sketch from fancy, but the confessions of an actor in those scenes, a Republican, and a member of the Convention.[3] "We were but weak creatures," he says, "abandoned to ourselves, and scarcely knowing how to profit by the errors of the preceding day. We could only advance through a thousand obstacles, a thousand dangers, and thus, from mistake to mistake, from catastrophe to catastrophe, from overthrow to overthrow, painfully arrive at the grand result desired by all, but which no individual wisdom could assure to us beforehand."

[1] *Anc. Régime*, p. 224 sq.

[2] Bailleul, *Esprit. de la Révol.* ch. viii. The *carmagnole* consisted of enormous black pantaloons, a short jacket, a three-coloured vest, a Jacobite wig of short black hair, a terrible moustache, the *bonnet rouge*, and an enormous sabre. It was also the name of a song and dance.

[3] *Idem*, *Examen crit. de l'ouvrage de Mdme. de Staël*, t. i. p. 129.

The literary character of the Revolution was thus the cause of many of its mistakes and follies, and perhaps of some of its atrocities. As the English Puritans assumed Scriptural names, and set up as their example the scenes of the Old Testament, so many of the French demagogues imagined that they were emulating Brutus and other heroes of Roman story. The members of the Convention talked familiarly of poignarding one another; and it is possible that the memory of the proscriptions of Sulla and the Triumvirs may not have been without some influence on the massacres of the Revolution. M. Villemain attributes this affectation of antiquity to the influence of Rousseau.[1] Another cause, perhaps, was, that the French, finding no example of patriotism in their own annals, were obliged to recur to those of ancient times. This pedantry of patriotism seems to have been more especially characteristic of the Girondists. In the time of the Directory fêtes were given, in which ancient chariots were introduced, and the guests appeared in Greek costumes.[2] When Bonaparte made the Peace of Tolentino, and stipulated for the delivery of Roman statues and other works of art, he wrote to the Directory: "I have particularly insisted on the busts of Junius and Marcus Brutus, which shall be the first sent to Paris." The five Directors, at their reception of Bonaparte at the Luxembourg in 1797, appeared in Roman dresses; while he himself, who, no doubt, laughed at them in his sleeve, was very plainly attired.[3]

But we must remember, after all, that the French had a good cause; and though the crimes and follies with which they disgraced it, under the leadership of monsters like Danton, Marat, and Robespierre and their fellows, prevent us from looking on their struggles for liberty with the same unmixed satisfaction with which we regard those of some other great nations, yet we must not suffer ourselves to be diverted from taking a calm and equitable view of their revolution by the disgust or contempt which many of its scenes inspire. We must not confound the great body of the French people with the wretches to whom we have alluded. We must recollect that they had many just grounds of provocation; that the state of France demanded not a mere political revolution, but the reorganization of society from its very foundations; that such a change cannot suddenly be effected without inflicting for a time the severest social misery; that a

[1] "C'est lui (Rousseau), et non pas l'éducation des collèges, comme on l'a dit, qui avait créé cet enthousiasme de l'antiquité, fécond en parodies et en crimes." —Leçon xxii.

[2] Madame de Staël, *Considérations, &c.* p. iii. ch. ix.

[3] *Ibid.* chs. xxiii. xxvi.

reform begun under circumstances of violence is difficult, perhaps impossible, to be arrested at the point when it ceases to be any longer salutary; that the evils and calamities of the French Revolution must in great part be ascribed to the wretched government which rendered it inevitable. We must make allowance for a people oppressed and irritated by despotism, and accustomed to be guided and controlled in all their acts, who suddenly became their own masters, and who, from the arbitrary proceedings and *coups d'état* of the old *régime*, had ceased to feel any reverence for law and justice, and had come to regard them as mere fictions. We must also allow for their new and unexampled situation, for the alarm and suspicion which it necessarily created. A vague fear of brigands, which nobody could define, a fear of famine, more real and tangible; a fear of treachery, of foreign plots, of Pitt and Coburg. The alarm was increased by sudden calls to arms, the sound of the *tocsin*, the strange dresses and emblems, the new magistracies and tribunals, the dislocation and disruption of all social life. Thus terror ruled uncontrolled, and terror is soon precipitated into deeds of cruelty.

Resemblances between the French and English Revolutions have been ingeniously pointed out, which at first sight seem striking enough. In both countries an unpopular queen; the Long Parliament in England, and the self-constituted National Assembly in France; the flight of Louis to Varennes, and of Charles to the Isle of Wight; the trial and execution of both those monarchs; the government by the Parliament, and the government by the Convention; Cromwell and Bonaparte, who expel these assemblies and rule by the sword; the setting aside of the heirs of these usurpers, and the restoration of the legitimate Kings.[1] These resemblances, however, lie only on the surface. A deeper examination will discover that no two events of the same kind can be more opposite in their essential character than the French and English Revolutions. While the object of the one was to destroy, that of the other was to restore. In the Petition of Right, the English Parliament protested against certain of the King's acts which were the acknowledged prerogative of the French Monarch; such as the levying of taxes by his own authority, imprisoning his subjects and confiscating their property arbitrarily and without legal trial, billeting soldiers and mariners upon householders, &c. Against these abuses they appeal to the rights and liberties which they have *inherited* according to the

[1] See Croker's *Essays on the French Revolution*, p. 10.

laws and statutes of the realm, such as the Great Charters, statutes of Edward I., Edward III., and others.[1] Such was the beginning of the English Revolution. But what was the course of the first National Assembly? After a long and splendid career in arts and arms, the most polished nation in Europe found it necessary to assume the position of Man just emerged from his primeval forests, and like the original societies imagined by Rousseau and other speculative politicians, to settle the elementary conditions of its civil state. Everything that had gone before was swept away, and a constitution was built up on paper from first principles as deduced from the supposed natural rights of Man. A practical statesman would refrain from enunciating these elementary principles, which, in fact, are little more than truisms, though it may be said that they had a peculiar significance in France, as showing the hatred towards the privileged classes, and indicating the levelling system which was to follow. Another striking difference is, that while in England the quarrel was in great part founded on religious disputes, and fanaticism was a principal agent, in France religion was discarded altogether.

As the whole method and character of the two revolutions was diametrically opposed, so also was the conduct of the two Kings. Charles I. had violated the Constitution by not calling a Parliament during a space of twelve years; Louis XVI., though bound by no law but his own will, assembled the *Etats généraux*, which had not been summoned for nearly two centuries; during the abeyance of the English Parliament, the Star Chamber had proceeded in the most absolute and illegal manner, while the French King, instead of increasing, considerably mitigated the arbitrary powers, such as *lettres de cachet*, &c., which were at his disposal; Charles began a civil war and took up arms against his subjects; Louis could not be persuaded to shed the blood of his people, even in the most urgent cases of self-defence.

In judging the French Revolution from its effects, which, however, may still be said to be in progress, we must on the whole pronounce it to have been beneficial. It delivered France from an arbitrary and unbounded royal prerogative, from an intolerant Church and a tyrannical feudal nobility; and it welded the previously ill-cemented provinces into one compact and powerful body; in short, into the present French nation. It will hardly be disputed that France of the present day is an in-

[1] The characters of the French and English Revolutions are very justly discriminated in Mr. Massey's *Reign of George III.* vol. iv. ch. 33.

comparably greater and more powerful State than it ever was under the ancient dynasty. But notwithstanding the vast effects of the French Revolution on the material condition of Europe, its moral influence does not appear to have been permanent. In the latter respect it is far behind the Reformation. Had the Revolution been successful, had it established a democratic republic or even a stable constitutional monarchy, its moral effects would have been incalculable. France would have become the model country of Europe and perhaps the foster-mother of a universal democracy; as it is, her example offers rather warning than encouragement. It may be remarked, for the credit of human nature, that the excesses of the French democrats were not imitated in those countries where their principles had produced a revolution. Neither massacres, nor incendiarism, nor sacrilege, nor proscriptions took place in the Netherlands, on the banks of the Rhine, in Switzerland, and Italy. It may, too, be observed as a singular fact that in foreign countries their absurd and abominable principles found readier acceptance among the higher classes of society than among the lower and more uneducated. In Germany the peasants of Suabia and the Palatinate were the chief opponents of the French Revolution, while the Princes and States of the Empire made but a feeble resistance, and ultimately took advantage of it to forward their own selfish interests. It was to the peasants of Northern Italy that the allies were considerably indebted for their rapid triumphs in 1799; it was the *lazzaroni* and peasants of Naples who defended the capital against the French, re-established the King, and drove the French from Rome. The same class of people in Piedmont displayed the greatest devotion to their Sovereign, and often proved a serious impediment to the progress of the French arms.

CHAPTER LIII.

THE first acts of the French *tiers état*, or Commons, after constituting themselves a National Assembly,[1] were to declare the legislative power indivisible, and to annul all the existing taxes, on the ground that only those are lawful which have received the formal consent of the nation; but to obviate a dissolution of the Assembly, they decreed the continuance of the present taxes so long as their session should last. These vigorous proceedings filled the Court with dismay. To avert the danger, recourse was had to one of those false steps which ultimately caused the ruin of the Monarchy. It was resolved that the King, in a royal session, should endeavour to restore a good understanding between the different orders, and reduce their proceedings to some regularity. It was thought that, as in the ancient days of the Monarchy, the Assembly might be overawed by the King's presence, and by a few words delivered in the accustomed tone of absolute authority. Such a step was in obvious contradiction to the very nature of the Assembly; for, if the King's voice was to prevail, to what purpose had he summoned the representatives of the people?

Necker must share the blame of this measure, though not of the manner in which it was executed. That Minister still hoped to carry his favourite project of two Chambers, voting in common on general and financial matters, but separately in things that more particularly concerned the respective orders. His own scheme was not a very liberal one. Everything was to come from the King's concession. Necker drew up a royal address in a tone of mildness and conciliation, in which the vote *per capita* was placed first, and the less palatable part of the scheme in the sequel.[2] The Council, however, took the matter out of his hands, and altered his draft of the speech so materially, and, it must be allowed, so injudiciously, that Necker considered himself justified in absenting himself from the royal session.

[1] See above, p. 296.

[2] The address, as first proposed by Necker, will be found in the Appendix to Bertrand de Moleville's *Mémoires*.

The royal session, originally fixed for June 22nd, was postponed till the following day; meanwhile the Assembly was adjourned, the hall where they sat was ordered to be closed, and the deputies who presented themselves were brutally repulsed. But the more turbulent leaders of the *tiers état*, particularly Bailly, assembled the larger part of that order in a neighbouring tennis-court; where the Abbé Sieyès, perceiving their excited state, proposed that they should at once leave Versailles for Paris, and proceed to make decrees in the name of the nation. It was to avert this step that Mounier proposed the celebrated oath that they should not separate till they had established a constitution.[1]

On the following day, the tennis-court having been hired by some of the princes in order to prevent these meetings, the deputies repaired to the church of St. Louis. Here, to their great joy, and to the consternation of the Court, they were joined by the Archbishops of Bordeaux and Vienne, the Bishops of Chartres and Rhodez, and 145 representatives of the clergy, besides all the nobles of Dauphiné; in the states of which province it was customary for the three orders to sit together.

When the Chambers again assembled, on June 23rd, the King undoubtedly made some important concessions, and such as, under other circumstances, might probably have been satisfactory. He abolished the *taille*, vested solely in the States-General the power of levying taxes, submitted the public accounts to their examination, did away with *corvées* and several other vexatious and oppressive grievances. But these concessions were made to spring from the royal grace and favour, and not from constitutional right, thus giving no security for their continuance. The clergy were to have a special *veto* in all questions of religion. The equality of imposts would be sanctioned only if the clergy and nobles consented to renounce their pecuniary privileges. The admission of *roturiers* to commands in the army was expressly refused. All that the *tiers état* had hitherto done was annulled. Above all, the King willed that the three orders should remain distinct, and deliberate separately; though, if they wished to unite, he would permit it for this session alone, and that only for affairs of a general nature; and he concluded by ordering the members to separate immediately, and to meet next morning, each in the chamber appropriated to his order. This, as a modern historian remarks, was again to hand

[1] Such is the real history of this famous oath, according to Mallet du Pan, who appears to have had it from Mounier himself. See *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. i. p. 165 note.

over France to the privileged classes.[1] The speech was delivered in a tone of absolute authority, neither suitable to the present posture of affairs, nor to the natural temper of the King.[2]

The nobles and part of the clergy followed the King when he retired. But the Commons, by the mouth of Mirabeau, when summoned to leave the hall by M. de Brézé, the master of the ceremonies, refused to do so, unless expelled by military force; and they proceeded to confirm their previous resolutions, which the King had annulled, and to declare the persons of the deputies inviolable; thus showing their determination to maintain the sovereignty which they had usurped. In short, the attempted *coup d'état* had failed; while the applause with which Necker was everywhere greeted afforded a striking proof of the popular feeling. On the very same evening the King felt himself compelled to the humiliating step of requesting that Minister to retain his portfolio; thus virtually condemning his own speech. Although some attempt had been made at military display, it was impossible to carry out by force the royal dictates so haughtily delivered; and the Ministers had only succeeded in making the King to be disobeyed *in person*, and bringing his authority into contempt.

The consequences of this imprudent policy soon became apparent. On the day after the royal session the majority of the clergy, composed of *curés*, who, from their constant intercourse with the people, were disposed to take the popular side, joined the Commons; and, on June 26th, the Bishops of Orange and Autun, and the Archbishop of Paris, did the same. The Bishop of Autun, Talleyrand Périgord, here gave the first proof of that unerring sagacity which, through all the eventful changes of the Revolution, enabled him to distinguish the winning side. The conduct of the Archbishop of Paris was the result of popular violence. A mob had stormed his palace, and, with threats of assassination, extorted his promise to join the Commons. The secession of the clergy was immediately followed by that of forty-seven of the nobles, chiefly the friends of Necker, and including the Duke of Orleans. The Court, alarmed by reports that extensive massacres were planning, that 100,000 rebels were in full march, and others of the like kind,[3] now deemed it prudent to yield to the popular wish. The King addressed letters to the

[1] Von Sybel, *Revolutions-Zeit*, i. 67 (Eng. transl.).

[2] The King's speech will be found in Toulongeon, *Hist. de France depuis la Révol.* t. i.; *Pièces justif.* p. 77; and in the *Hist. Parl.* t. ii.

[3] Ferrières, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 65 sq. (Coll. Berville et Barrière).

clergy and nobles, who remained out, requesting them to join the Commons without delay; these were backed by others from the Count d'Artois, stating that the King's life was in danger; and under these representations the union of the whole Assembly was effected, June 27th, amid the enthusiastic cheers of the *tiers état*. Thus the nobles who, in the States-General of 1614, had exclaimed, "There is the same difference between us and the *tiers état* as between master and valet," were at length compelled to abandon their arrogant pretensions.[1]

One of the worst symptoms for the royal cause was the disaffection of the soldiery. There had been great abuses in the administration of the army. While forty-six million livres were allotted in the budget to the officers, only forty-four million were distributed among the men.[2] The Count de St. Germain, appointed Minister of War in 1775, had contributed to the disaffection of the troops by reforms and innovations in discipline, and especially by the introduction of corporal punishment. The army, corrupted by a long peace, had become almost a body of citizens, and had extensively imbibed the prevailing democratic opinions. This was more particularly the case with the *Gardes Françaises*, who, being quartered in Paris, mixed freely with the people, and were thus exposed to every kind of seduction. This regiment, when called out to defend the archbishop's palace, had refused to fire upon the mob. Their colonel, M. de Chatelêt, had imprisoned in the Abbaye eleven of his men, who had taken an oath not to obey any order at variance with the resolutions of the Assembly, but they were delivered and fêted by the people; while the dragoons sent to disperse the mob had fraternized with them.[3]

The Court, however, had not yet abandoned the project of carrying matters with a high hand. Large bodies of troops, consisting chiefly of German and Swiss regiments, who could be best relied on, were assembled in the neighbourhood of Paris, and Marshal Broglie was summoned to Versailles to take the command of them. All this was done with too much display, if the intention was to act; and with too little, if the object was only to overawe and intimidate. The King was to appear in the Assembly, and compel it to accept the Declaration of June 23rd, of which 4,000 copies had been printed for circulation in the provinces; and the Assembly was then to be dissolved.[4] The King suffered these

[1] Florimond Rapine, ap. L. Blanc, t. i. p. 178.
[2] Necker, *Administration, &c.* ap. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. i. p. 72.
[3] Michelet, *ibid.* t. i. p. 82.
[4] Ferrières, t. i. p. 70 sqq.

preparations to be made, though it lay not in his character ever to employ them. When his advisers, comprising the more resolute or violent party of the Court, including the Queen, the Count d'Artois, the Polignacs, the Baron de Bretueil, and others, thought themselves sufficiently strong, they persuaded him to dismiss Necker and three other Ministers, July 11th; another false step, which may be said to have put the seal to the Revolution.

At this time the aspect of Paris was alarming. Thousands of ragged and starving wretches had crowded thither from the provinces. The bakers' doors were besieged; bread was upwards of four sous a pound, then a famine price, and very bad; a sort of camp of 20,000 mendicants had been formed at Montmartre. Thus all the materials for sedition and violence were collected, and the Palais Royal, belonging to the Duke of Orleans, was a centre for setting them in motion. No police officer could enter its privileged precincts, and, by the connivance of the Duke, its garden and coffee-houses became the resort of all the agitators and demagogues of Paris. The Café Foy, especially, was converted into a sort of revolutionary club, whose leading members were Camille Desmoulins and Loustalot, two advocates who had abandoned the profession of the law for the more profitable one of journalists, and a democratic nobleman of herculean proportions and stentorian voice, the Marquis de St. Huruge. A secret conclave sat in an upper story, concocting inflammatory addresses, and planning seditious riots; whilst on the floor of the *café*, where a bar had been erected resembling that in the National Assembly, the demagogues appeared and made their incendiary motions. At night the garden was filled with a promiscuous crowd; little groups were formed, in which calumnious denunciations were made, and the most violent resolutions adopted. It seems to have been by this conclave of sedition that the brigands called Marseillese were brought to Paris, who took the lead in every act of violence and blood, and inspired the Parisian populace with their own ferocity.[1]

The news of Necker's dismissal reached Paris the following day (Sunday, July 12th) about four o'clock in the afternoon. The people immediately crowded to the Palais Royal. Camille Desmoulins appeared at a window of the Café Foy with a pistol in his hand, and exhorted the people to resistance. He then descended

[1] See Camille Desmoulins, *Révol. de France; Actes des Apôtres*, No. xxvii. ap. Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. pp. 59, 119; Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 123.

into the garden, plucked a leaf, and placed it in his hat by way of a green cockade, the colour of Necker's livery, an example which was immediately imitated by the mob. Busts of Necker and the Duke of Orleans were seized at a sculptor's on the Boulevard du Temple, and paraded through the streets by the rabble, some thousands of whom were armed with pikes, sabres, and other weapons. The theatres were compelled to close their doors, and several houses and shops were plundered. The mob, on entering the Place Louis XV., now Place de la Concorde, were charged and dispersed by a cavalry regiment, the *Royal Allemand*, commanded by the Prince de Lambesc, and some blood was shed. The person who carried the bust of Necker, described as "an elegant young man," was shot, and a Savoyard, who bore that of the Duke of Orleans was wounded. The Guards sided with the people.

The riots were continued on the following day. The populace crowded to the Hôtel de Ville to demand arms and ammunition, which were distributed to them by a member of the Electoral Committee. Parties, headed by some of the Guards, broke open the prisons, liberated the prisoners confined for debt, plundered the Convent St. Lazare of grain, and the *Garde Meuble* of arms. But the most important event of July 13th was the creation of a civic militia of 48,000 men, by the self-constituted Permanent Committee of the Electors of Paris. These Electors, for the most part wealthy burgesses, had resolved, in spite of the prohibition of the Government, to remain assembled, in order to complete their instructions to the Deputies. After the *coup d'état* of June 23rd, they met at a *traiteur's*, and resolved to support the Assembly. Thuriot, one of the most active of their number, advised them to go to the Hôtel de Ville and demand the Salle St. Jean for their permanent sittings, which was abandoned to them.[1] The institution of the Civic Guard proclaimed the assumption of the sovereignty by the people. It consisted of citizens of some substance, and its creation had been suggested by the numerous acts of violence and rapine which had taken place.

Next day, July 14th, the insurrection assumed a still more violent and decided character. A vast crowd repaired to the Hôtel des Invalides, which they entered without resistance, although six battalions of Swiss and 800 horse were encamped in the immediate neighbourhood. Here the people seized 28,000

[1] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. i. p. 70.

muskets and several cannon. Arms and ammunition had also been procured at the Hôtel de Ville. Shouts of "*To the Bastille!*" were now raised, and the armed multitude directed themselves upon that fortress. Its garrison consisted of only eighty-two *Invalides*, and thirty-two Swiss, and these were destitute of provisions for a siege; but the place was strongly fortified, and well supplied with cannon and ammunition. The Governor, M. de Launay, had made preparations for defence, and a determined commander might have held the place against an undisciplined mob till succour should arrive. But De Launay was not a regular soldier. He was weak enough to admit Thuriot, the Elector already mentioned, into the fortress, and to parley with him. Although Thuriot assured the people of the pacific intentions of the Governor, he could not persuade them to desist from the siege. Many of the assailants displayed remarkable instances of valour, especially Elie and Hullin, belonging to the Guards, who had joined the mob, and a man named Maillard, whom we shall meet again in other scenes of the Revolution. The *curé* of St. Estéphe was one of the leaders. After a siege of a few hours, when the garrison had lost only three or four men, and the people nearly two hundred, De Launay, urged by his French troops, offered to capitulate, in spite of the remonstrances of the Swiss commander. The capitulation stipulated that the lives of the garrison should be spared; but when the populace burst into the fortress they slew many of the *Invalides* as well as the Swiss, their fury being especially directed against the officers. De Launay, and his second in command, Major de Losme, were conducted towards the Hôtel de Ville, but were barbarously massacred in the Place de Grève, in spite of the efforts of Elie and Hullin to save them. These murders were immediately followed by that of M. de Flesselles, *Prévôt des Marchands*, or Provost of Paris, who was accused of having misled the people in their search for arms. The bleeding heads of De Launay and the Provost were hacked off, stuck upon pikes, and paraded through the streets in a sort of triumphal procession of the conquerors of the Bastille, and the bearers of them appear to have been paid by the civic authorities for their revolting services.[1] When the Bastille was invaded, only seven prisoners were found, the greater part confined for forgery, and not a single one for a political

[1] See the *Report* of the Abbé Lefèvre, one of the Committee of Electors, in Toulongeon, t. i.; *Pièces Justif.* p. 94; and the Interrogatory of Desnot at the Châtelet, in Croker's *Essays on the French Revolution*, p. 67.

offence. The fortress was soon after demolished to the foundations, by order of the National Assembly.

On the day after the capture of the Bastille an elector proposed Lafayette as commander of the Civic Guard, a nomination which was received with universal approbation. As civic guards had also been instituted in many provincial towns, Lafayette, with a view to unite all the militias of the Kingdom, now changed their name to that of "National Guard." And as the metropolitan force had hitherto worn a cockade composed of blue and red, which were the Orleans colours as well as those of the City of Paris, he added the Bourbon white, by way of distinction. Such was the origin of the tricolor, which the new commander-in-chief declared would travel round the world.[1] In like manner Bailly, the astronomer, now President of the National Assembly, was proposed as *Prévôt des Marchands*, in place of the murdered De Flesselles. "No," exclaimed Brissot, "not Provost of the Merchants, but Mayor of Paris;" and the new magistrate and his new title were adopted by acclamation.[2]

The Monarchy was evidently in the throes of a crisis. Two courses only were open to the King: either to fly to some other part of the Kingdom and place himself at the head of his troops in defence of his throne, or to accept the Revolution. The former of these steps was advocated by Marie Antoinette and a considerable portion of the Court and Council. But its success would have been very doubtful. The greater part of the army, as well as of the nation, were favourable to the Revolution; above all, Louis XVI. possessed not energy enough to carry out successfully so bold a step. He decided for the other alternative. On July 15th, after learning from the Duke de Liancourt the capture of the Bastille, which it had been endeavoured to conceal from him, he proceeded without state and ceremony, and accompanied only by his two brothers, Monsieur and the Count d'Artois, to the Assembly; where, addressing the Deputies as the representatives of the nation, and expressing his confidence in their fidelity and affection, he informed them that he had ordered the troops to quit Paris and Versailles, and authorized them to acquaint the authorities of the Capital with what he had done.

Not content with this step, Louis declared his intention of visiting Paris, in order, as he said, to put the seal to the reconciliation between Crown and people. The Queen was very much

[1] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, 1-89 (Eng. Trans.).

[2] Ferrières, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 145; Bailly, *Mém.* t. ii. p. 25.

opposed to this proceeding, which certainly seems something worse than a mere work of supererogation; a voluntary and even pompous acknowledgment of the degradation of the throne, which afforded a triumph to the populace, and was calculated to increase its audacity. But the King, having first taken the sacrament, and having given his elder brother, the Count of Provence, a paper appointing him Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom, in case anything should happen to himself, set off for Paris, July 17th, accompanied by 100 members of the National Assembly. He was received at the gates of Paris by Bailly, the new Mayor, and by the National Guard, under arms. In an address, more remarkable for its truth than for its politeness and good taste, Bailly observed, in presenting the keys of the City: "These, Sire, are the same keys that were offered to Henry IV., the conqueror of his people; to-day it is the people who have reconquered their King." Louis then passed on to the Hôtel de Ville, escorted by those armed bands which had recently given such terrible proofs of their ferocity; yet he betrayed not the least sign of trepidation. He appeared at a window of the Hôtel de Ville, with the national colours on his breast; he confirmed Bailly and Lafayette in their respective offices; announced his consent to the recall of Necker; and after listening to a few speeches, and expressing his satisfaction at finding himself in the midst of his people, he took his departure amid cries of *Vive le Roi!*

These scenes of violence, the inability of the Government to repress them, the manifest ascendency of the Revolution, induced many of the princes and nobles to emigrate. The King's brother, the Count d'Artois, the Prince of Condé, the Prince of Conti, the Duke d'Enghien, the Duke of Bourbon, the Duke of Polignac, and his family, and numerous other persons of distinction, left Paris for Turin a few days after the capture of the Bastille. This conduct of the nobles is inexcusable. It was they who had contributed to the Revolution by bringing into vogue the new philosophy, and now they deserted the throne, as well as their own cause, which they had endangered; made by their flight a sort of declaration of war against the nation, and, at the same time, a confession of the hopelessness of resistance. It can hardly be said, however, with Madame de Staël,[1] that they were in no danger. A list of proscriptions had been formed at the Palais Royal, in which the Queen, the Count d'Artois, the Duchess of

[1] *Œuvres*, t. xiii. p. 262.

Polignac and others, were marked for death.[1] Such was the surveillance already exercised over the royal family that the Queen dared not to be present at the departure of her friend, the Duchess of Polignac.[2]

The King's visit to Paris had no effect in taming the ferocity of the people, which had been whetted by the taste of blood. A few days after, July 22nd, Foulon, an old man of seventy-five, one of the new ministers appointed after Necker's dismissal, and his son-in-law, Berthier de Sauvigny, were hanged at a lamp in the Place de Grève, in spite of all the attempts of Bailly and Lafayette to save them. This crime was committed by assassins hired at a great cost by the revolutionary leaders.[3] Foulon had made himself unpopular by his harshness, and by some contemptuous remarks which he was reported to have made about the people, but which were most probably calumnies of the journals. Berthier had been an honest and intelligent administrator, but disliked for his haughtiness. A dragoon ripped out his heart; his head, as well as that of his father-in-law, was cut off and paraded through Paris. Lafayette, disgusted at brutalities which he could not control, tendered his resignation; but the Sections refused to accept it. These atrocities were approved of even by men of position and education. Barnave, a member of the Assembly, who, however, afterwards displayed a better spirit, remarked in reference to the murder of Foulon and his son-in-law: "Was, then, the blood that has been shed so pure?" And Camille Desmoulins, who possessed considerable talent, and was far from being the most depraved of the revolutionary leaders, assumed, with a repulsive levity, the title of *Procureur-Général de la lanterne*, or solicitor-general for the lamp.[4] The *lanterne* of the Place de Grève was made to play the part of Pasquin's statue at Rome, and facetious addresses to the people were issued in its name.

The example of the metropolis was speedily imitated in the provinces. Municipal guards were everywhere instituted under the ostensible pretence of averting plunder and violence; but the men composing them were all adverse to the ancient institutions. Tolls and custom-houses were destroyed, and many unpopular officials

[1] Ferrières, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 136; cf. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. i. p. 107.

[2] Madame Campan, *Memoirs*, vol. ii. ch. iii. (Engl. Transl.).

[3] Mirabeau's *Letters*, ap. Von Sybel, i. p. 81.

[4] Toulongeon observes, t. i. p. 115, that the burlesque pleasantry of the term tended to render murder "une gaieté à la mode." The lamp became one of the curiosities of Paris, and was visited by every traveller. *Ibid. Pièces Justif.* p. 114.

and suspected engrossers of corn were hanged. The movement spread to the rural districts of central and southern France, and especially of Brittany; châteaux and convents were destroyed, and in Alsace and Franche-Comté several of the nobles were put to death, in some cases with horrible tortures. It was about this time that the term *aristocrat* began to be used as synonymous with an enemy of the people. At Caen, M. de Belzunce, a major in the army, denounced in the infamous Journal of Marat, was slain by the people for endeavouring to maintain discipline in his regiment; a woman tore out his heart, and is said to have devoured it![1] In the northern parts of France the peasants were less violent, and contented themselves with refusing to pay tithes or to perform any feudal services. Throughout great part of France a vague terror prevailed of an army of brigands said to be paid by the aristocrats to destroy the crops by mowing them in the blade, in order to produce a famine.

The order for Necker's recall overtook him at Basle. He returned to Versailles towards the end of July, presented himself to the National Assembly, then hastened to Paris, where, by dint of intreaty, he procured from the Committee of Electors a general amnesty for the enemies of the Revolution; a decree, however, which the Sections immediately compelled the Electors to reverse, and which had only the effect of rendering Necker himself suspected. He had not even yet discovered the true character of the Revolution. He was still infatuated enough to think that he could direct a movement to which his own acts had so essentially contributed; and in his overweening confidence he neglected to form a party in the Assembly, and to conciliate its more dangerous leaders.

The National Assembly, or, as it was called from its labours in drawing up a constitution, the CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY, contained some of the ablest men in France, and many of its members were undoubtedly animated with a sincere desire to establish, on a lasting basis, the liberty and welfare of the French people. It was divided into three principal parties. On the right of the President sat the Conservatives, or supporters of the ancient *régime*, composed mostly of the prelates and higher nobles. The chief speaker, and it may be said the only orator, on this side was the Abbé Maury, though Cazalès defended with considerable ability the cause of the nobles. The centre was occupied by the Constitutionalists, who were desirous of establishing a limited monarchy, somewhat after the English model. The most distinguished members of this party

[1] Prudhomme, *Hist. Générale*, p. 146; Dumouriez, *Mémoires*.

were the Count of Clermont Tonnerre, Count Lally Tollendal, Mounier, Malouet, the Duke de la Rochefoucault, the Duke de Liancourt, the Viscount Montmorenci, the Marquis de Montesquiou, and others. From the supposed stagnation of its principles this section was called the *Marais*. The popular, or ultra-democratic party occupied the benches on the left. The principles of this party were neither very defined nor very consistent. They, of course, carried their views further than the Constitutionalists; but none of them were yet Republicans, though some may have desired a change of dynasty. The chief political principle which they held in common was the union of the Monarchy with a single Chamber, or what has been called a Royal Democracy. Among them might be seen the Duke of Orleans, the Marquis Lafayette, Bailly, Mirabeau, Duport, Barnave, the two Lameths, the Abbé Sieyès, Talleyrand, Robespierre, and others. As the Revolution proceeded, many of these men became Republicans, whilst others, on the contrary, joined the Constitutional party.

Louis Philippe Joseph, Duke of Orleans, great-grandson of the Regent, possessed all his ancestor's profligacy and want of principle, without his ability. The chief motives of his political conduct were hatred of the reigning family, and especially of the Queen, and some vague hopes that their overthrow might enable him to usurp the Crown. But nature had not qualified him for such a part. He was destitute of the qualities which inspire confidence and devotion, and at no time does he appear to have had adherents enough to constitute a party.[1] Exhausted by a dissolute life, the tool of designing men, who employed his enormous wealth to forward their own purposes, he was but the dupe, and at last the victim, of the Revolution.

Robespierre, an advocate of Arras, whose name became at last the epitome of the Revolution, played but a subordinate part in the Constituent Assembly. He was considered a dull man, and his appearance in the tribune was the signal for merriment. When with pain and difficulty he expressed his opinions in dry, inflexible formulas, transports of insulting mirth broke out on all sides.[2] Such was then the man who was afterwards to inspire his audience with very different emotions. But Robespierre was not to be so put down. He continued his efforts with the perseverance which forms so marked a trait in his character; and after the death of

[1] Both Madame de Staël, *Considérations, &c.* Partie ii. ch. vi. and her critic, Bailleul, *Examen, &c.* t. i. p. 336, are at one upon this point.

[2] Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 36.

Mirabeau, he began to be heard with more attention, and even acquired a considerable influence in the Assembly.

Of all the early leaders of the Revolution Mirabeau was by far the most remarkable. Honoré Gabriel Riquetti, Count de Mirabeau, was the son of the Marquis Mirabeau, to whom we have already alluded as the author of *L'Ami du Peuple*, and was born at Bignon, in March, 1749. The family was originally of Neapolitan extraction, but had been long settled in Provence. The early youth of Count Mirabeau was marked by profligacy, united, however, with brilliant talents, and considerable literary acquirements. After being imprisoned more than once at the instance of his father, after marrying a rich heiress, squandering her fortune, and then deserting her for the wife of the Marquis de Mounier, whom he had seduced, he was compelled to fly to Holland with his new mistress, where their sole support was derived from his pen. Many of his early productions are licentious in the extreme, but were mingled with works on political subjects. Sometimes he was base enough to receive the wages of a hired libellist; sometimes he sold to a new purchaser manuscripts which had been already paid for. His father called him, "My son, the word-merchant."[1] From Holland he was transferred by a *lettre de cachet* to the dungeons of Vincennes; and after his liberation from that prison he passed some time in England and in Prussia. By temper and inclination an aristocrat, the French Revolution found Mirabeau ready to plunge into all the excesses of democracy in order to retrieve his ruined fortunes. His personal qualities fitted him for the part of a tribune of the people. In person stout and muscular, though somewhat undersized; having a countenance seamed with the small-pox, and of almost repulsive ugliness, but animated with the fire of genius, and capable of striking an adversary with awe, he possessed an eloquence of that fiery and impetuous kind which is irresistible in popular assemblies. His disorderly and adventurous life had made him reckless and abandoned to a degree that he seemed almost to glory in his infamy; while the debts with which he was overwhelmed rendered him willing to sell, or rather as he himself expressed it, to hire himself, to the Government, or to anyone who would pay an adequate price for his talents and services.[2]

The debates of the Assembly were conducted with that mixture of formality and vivaciousness which is peculiar to the French character. They consisted for the most part of long and laboured

[1] Le Blanc, *ibid.* t. ii. p. 241.
[2] For Mirabeau's private character, see Dumont, *Souvenirs de Mirabeau.*

harangues, or rather regular treatises, beginning from first principles, prepared and generally written beforehand. Even the impetuous Mirabeau adopted this method, and his orations are said not to have been always composed by himself. Hence it followed that the different speeches had little connection with one another; the arguments of preceding speakers were left unanswered, and the debates resembled a series of essays delivered in an academy, rather than the intellectual gladiatorship of a popular assembly.[1] The Chamber frequently became the scene of indescribable disorder and tumult. All the members spoke at once with violent gesticulations and confused and unintelligible apostrophes, which were echoed back by the spectators in the tribunes. In vain the President endeavoured to restore order by ringing his bell with all his might; while the orators, with animated looks, their lips in motion, but quite inaudible, beat the air with their arms, and resembled wrestlers preparing for a contest. A German who was present at some of these debates compares them to the hubbub and confusion of a Jews' Synagogue.[2] But the Assembly were no more their own masters than were the King and Government. The persons styling themselves "The Patriotic Assembly of the Palais Royal," overawed the Deputies with open threats. Thus, for instance, they compelled Thouret, who passed for an aristocrat, to resign the Presidency of the Assembly.[3] Another means of intimidation was through the admission of the public into the tribunes, or spectators' galleries. This custom had been established by Duport, Lameth, and Barnave, a triumvirate which at this time formed the nucleus of the democratic party, and became subsequently the principal leaders in the Jacobin Club. The tribunes, when occasion required, were filled with the most ferocious of the populace, who are supposed to have been paid.

While such was the character of the Assembly and such the state of France, the châteaux and convents blazing in the provinces, the capital in a state of open revolt, and while no authority appeared either able or willing to put a stop to these excesses, the famous sacrifice of their privileges by the nobles and clergy, on the night of August 4th, has at least as much the appearance of a concession extorted from fear as of that generous and patriotic devotion to which some writers have ascribed it. The privileged orders were in fact giving up only what they had no longer any hope of retain-

[1] Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* iii. 76.
[2] See Campe, *Briefe aus Paris*, S. 175.
[3] Mounier, *Exposé de ma Conduite*, p 31, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 103.

ing. The self-sacrifice was initiated by the Viscount de Noailles, who proposed the abolition of all feudal rights and of the remains of personal servitude. Moved by a sort of contagious enthusiasm, the nobles and landed proprietors now vied with one another in offering up their privileges. In this memorable night were decreed the abolition of serfdom, the power of redeeming seignorial rights, the suppression of seignorial jurisdiction, the abolition of exclusive rights of chase and warren, the abolition of tithe, the equalization of imposts, the admission of all ranks to civil and military offices, the abolition of the sale of charges, the reformation of *jurandes* and *maîtrises*, and the suppression of sinecure pensions. The Assembly, as if overcome with a sense of its own liberality, and desirous of connecting the King with such important reforms, decreed that a medal should be struck in commemoration of them, on which Louis should be designated as the restorer of French liberty. These renunciations were followed on the part of many of the bishops and higher clergy by the resignation of their richest benefices and preferments. Hereditary nobility had already been abolished by a Decree of June 19th. Thus the abuses of centuries fell at a single blow. And though, when the enthusiasm of the moment had cooled, and these general resolutions came to be discussed in detail in order to be embodied in decrees, enough opposition was manifested to destroy all gratitude, yet they were substantially carried out and presented to the King, who presided at a *Te Deum* performed on the occasion. It was, however, observed with dismay that concessions so ample failed to tranquillize the public mind. Acts of atrocious violence were still committed in the provinces; châteaux continued to be burnt; and the people, not content with the enjoyment of their newly-acquired rights, perpetrated frightful devastations on the estates of their former oppressors.

The Assembly having thus cleared the ground, entered on their task of building up a new Constitution. By way of preamble they drew up a Declaration of the Rights of Man, at the end of which they recapitulated all the privileges, distinctions, and monopolies which they had abolished.[1] On the motion of Lafayette, at whose suggestion the Declaration had been made, the right of resistance to oppression was included in it. The constitutional labours of the Assembly will claim our attention at its dissolution, and it will here suffice to state that the three principal questions first discussed were those of the King's *veto*, of the permanence or periodicity of the Assembly, and whether it should

[1] In Lacretelle, *Hist. de France*, t. vii., and in the *Hist. Parlem.* t. ii.

consist of one or more Chambers. The *veto* gave rise to much angry discussion, both within and without the Assembly. It was warmly debated whether there should be any at all, and, if any, whether it should be absolute or merely suspensive. The patriots of the Palais Royal addressed a letter to the President, in which they said, "they had the honour to inform him that, if the aristocratic part of the Assembly continued to disturb the public harmony, 15,000 men were ready to 'illumine' (*éclairer*) their châteaux and houses, and particularly that of the President himself."[1] At this time, however, there was a sort of reaction at the Hôtel de Ville, and the Palais Royal was kept in order. Mirabeau, to the surprise of many, was a warm partisan of the *veto*. He had declared that, without it, he would rather live at Constantinople than in France; that he knew nothing more terrible than the aristocratic sovereignty of 600 persons.[2] Louis himself is said to have preferred a suspensory to an absolute *veto;* and it was at last decreed that the King should have the power of suspending a measure during two legislatures, or, as we should say, two parliaments, each lasting two years. Montesquieu's school, or that which proposed the English Constitution as a model, and consequently advocated two Chambers, mustered very strong in the Committee of Constitution. But the idea of an Upper House was contrary to the current of popular feeling; the people regarded it as a counter-revolution, while the ancient *noblesse* contemned it as a new-fangled dignity. The establishment of a single Chamber was also aided by the counter-revolutionary party, who, not unreasonably, imagined that such a Constitution could not be durable, though they did not anticipate the manner of its fall. It was decided that the Legislature should be permanent. It was also decreed by acclamation, September 15th, that the King's person was inviolable, the Throne indivisible, the Crown hereditary in the reigning family from male to male in the order of primogeniture.[3]

While the Assembly were still engaged on this subject an event occurred which gave a new turn to the Revolution, and may be accounted the chief cause which ultimately rendered all their labours nugatory. A plot had been formed to bring the King to Paris, and rumours of it had reached the Court. Mira-

[1] *Moniteur*, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 104.

[2] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. i. p. 42. The nature of the *veto* was a great puzzle to the common people. Many took it to be some dangerous person, and one man voted him *à la lanterne!* Toulongeon, t. i. p. 114.

[3] *Moniteur*, Séance du Septembre 15ème, ap. L. Blanc, t. iii. p. 82.

beau appears to have been in the secret, and had obscurely intimated it to Blaizot, the King's librarian. He had also been heard to say that an insurrection would be possible only if the women should take part in it and place themselves at its head. It can hardly be doubted that the Duke of Orleans was at the bottom of the plot, whose creature Mirabeau at that time was. The Duke and his partisans hoped at least to alarm the King into flight; perhaps to effect his deposition, or even his murder. Several Royalist deputies had received confidential letters that a decisive blow was meditated, and had attempted, but without effect, to persuade Louis XVI. to transfer the Assembly to Tours. But Lafayette, who virtually held the control of the Revolution,—a vain man, desirous of playing a part, but without settled principles, or even definite aims,—had also conceived the idea of bringing the King to Paris. He had been encouraged in it, if not incited to it by the grenadiers of the National Guard, consisting of three companies of the *gardes Françaises* enrolled in that force, and receiving pay, who demanded to be led to Versailles. An event which occurred at this time hastened the catastrophe.

The military service of the Palace was performed by the National Guards of Versailles, and the only regular force there was a small body of *gardes du corps*. Under these circumstances it was thought necessary to provide for the security of the King and Royal family. The commanders of the National Guard of Versailles, declining to undertake that they would be capable of resisting some 2,000 well-armed and disciplined men, the municipality of the town were persuaded to demand the aid of a regiment; the King's orders were issued to that effect, and on September 23rd the regiment of Flanders arrived.[1] Efforts were soon made to seduce this regiment from its allegiance; while the Court, by marks of favour, sought to retain its affections. The officers of the *gardes du corps* and those of the National Guard of Versailles invited the newly-arrived officers to a dinner. There was nothing unusual in this; but the Court, by lending the Palace Theatre for the banquet, seemed to make it a kind of political demonstration. The boxes were filled with the ladies and retainers of the Court; the healths of the different members of the Royal family were drunk with enthusiasm, and, it is said,

[1] *Annals* of Bertrand de Moleville, translated by Dallas, vol. ii. ch. xv.; Prudhomme, *Hist. des erreurs, des fautes, et des crimes commis pendant la Revol.* t. iii. p. 164 sq.; *Evidence of Blaizot before the Châtelet, Procédure, &c.* p. 51, ap. L. Blanc, t. iii. ch. viii.; Croker, *Essays on the Fr. Revol.* p. 45; Toulongeon, t. i. p. 234.

with drawn swords; the toast of "The Nation" was either refused, or, at all events, omitted. As the bottle circulated, the enthusiasm naturally increased, and was wound up to the highest pitch of excitement when the Queen appeared, leading the Dauphin in her hand. The loyal song, *O Richard, ô mon Roi! l'univers t'abandonné,* was sung; the boxes were escaladed, and white cockades and black, the latter the Austrian colour, were distributed by the fair hands of the ladies.

The news of these proceedings, accompanied, of course, with the usual exaggerations, as that the national cockade had been trampled under foot, &c., caused a great sensation at Paris. Little groups assembled in the squares and public gardens, and alarming reports were circulated that a counter-revolution was preparing. The excitement was purposely increased by agitators, whose designs were promoted by the scarcity of bread which prevailed at that time. The supply of flour to the metropolis was always ill-regulated. There was never any considerable stock on hand; and Bailly, as appears from his *Mémoires,* was in a constant state of anxiety as to how the Parisians were to be fed. The cry against forestallers frightened the merchants from keeping any large stocks; the farmers, being molested in their trade, would not thrash; the millers would not grind. The municipality advanced large sums to keep down the price; but the consequence of this was that the *banlieue* for ten leagues round came to Paris to supply themselves with bread.[1] The emigration of the rich added to the distress. The scarcity seems also to have been aggravated by the artifices of designing persons, by buying up the bakers' stocks or by bribing them not to light their ovens. Thus all the materials of sedition were collected, and needed only the application of a torch to set them in a flame. At daybreak, October 5th, the Place de Grève was suddenly filled with troops of women; one of them, seizing a drum at a neighbouring guard-house, and beating it violently, went through the streets, followed by her companions, shouting *bread! bread!* They were gradually joined by bands of men, some of them in female attire, armed with pikes and clubs. A cry was raised, *To Versailles!* and the grotesque but ferocious army, led by Maillard, one of the heroes of the Bastille, took the road to that place.

Meanwhile Lafayette had lost many hours in obtaining the sanction and instructions of the Commune for his proceeding to Versailles with the National Guard, and it was not till late in the

[1] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* i. p. 233.

day that he began his march with a considerable body of that force. He was accompanied by two representatives of the Section of the Carmes, who were to present to the King, on the part of the *Commune* or municipality, the four following demands: That he should intrust the safety of his person to the National Guards of Paris and Versailles; that he should inform the *Commune* respecting the supply of corn; that he should give an unconditional assent to the Declaration of the Rights of Man; and that he should show proof of his love for the people by taking up his residence at Paris; that is, put himself in the power of the National Guard and their commander.[1] Lafayette halted his troops on the road, and caused them to take an oath to respect the Royal residence.

While the insurgents were approaching, St. Priest had in vain advised that their march should be arrested at the bridges over the Seine. When they arrived he urged the King to fly, telling him, what the event proved to be true, that if he was conducted to Paris his Crown was lost. Necker opposed both these counsels. The King's best safeguard, he said, was the affections of the people; and as the other Ministers were divided in opinion, nothing was done.[2] Meanwhile the women arrived; and a large body of them, headed by Maillard, penetrated into the Assembly. Maillard addressed the members with insulting words and gestures; asserted that there was a counter-revolutionary party among them; denounced the aristocrats as conspiring to starve the people, the *gardes du corps* as having insulted the national cockade. Outside a disturbance arose between the crowd and the King's Guards, which, however, was appeased by the arrival, about eleven o'clock at night, of Lafayette and his troops. Tranquillity seemed at last to be restored; five of the women, led by a notorious prostitute,[3] had been admitted to an audience of the King, and had retired overwhelmed with a sense of his kindness. With a base dereliction both of duty and humanity, Lafayette had retired to rest about an hour after his arrival, and without having taken due precautions for the safety of the Royal family. About five o'clock he was aroused by the report of fresh tumults. Some fighting had taken place between the mob and the troops, and several of the *gardes du corps* had been killed or wounded. The people had penetrated into the Palace through a gate negligently

[1] See for these occurrences, Von Sybel, B. ii. ch. 4.

[2] Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* iii. p. 207.

[3] Letter of Baron Goltz, ap. Von Sybel. i. 129.

left open; the Queen was barely able to escape, half-dressed, from her chamber to the King's apartments; the guards at her door had sacrificed their lives with heroic devotion, and the mob did not succeed in forcing an entrance. Lafayette persuaded the King to show himself on the balcony of the Palace; he himself led forward the Queen, accompanied by her children, and knelt down and kissed her hand amid the applause of the people. Tumultuous cries now arose of "The King to Paris!" Louis had expressed some hesitation on this point to the deputies of the *Commune*, though he had acceded to their other demands; but after a short interval he reappeared on the balcony and announced his intention of proceeding to the capital.

On this eventful morning the Duke of Orleans, dressed in a grey surtout and with a little switch in his hand, was seen mixing with the mob of rioters. He was saluted with cries of "Long live father Orleans! Long live *King* Orleans!" at which he was observed to smile. It was he who pointed out to the mob the staircase leading to the Queen's apartments. The man who kept the *buvette* of the Assembly distributed to all comers *pâtés*, ham, fruits, and wine at the Duke's expense. Mirabeau had been seen, on the previous day, going from group to group, with a sabre under his arm, and was heard to say, "My friends, we are with you." And it is certain, says M. Louis Blanc, that he had long been intriguing *for somebody*.[1]

The march of the crowd and captive King to Paris was at once horrible and grotesque. The Royal carriage was preceded by a disorderly cavalcade, composed of *gardes du corps* and *gardes Françaises*, who had exchanged parts of their uniform in token of peace and fraternity. Then followed several pieces of cannon, on which rode some of the women, bearing loaves and pieces of meat stuck on pikes and bayonets. Maillard and some of the women had been sent back to Paris in the Royal carriages. The heads of two of the faithful *gardes du corps*, which had been hacked off by the wretch known as Jourdan *Coupe-tête*, had been

[1] *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 251. For the facts adduced above, see the *Procédure* before the Châtelet. The most striking proof that the Duke of Orleans was plotting against the King's life, is a paper found several years after the Duke's execution, and dated October 6th, 1789, in which he orders his bankers not to pay the sums agreed upon, as Louis was still alive. "Courez vite, mon cher, chez le banquier, qu'il ne délivre pas la somme; l'argent n'est point gagné, le marmot vit encore." Ducoin, *Ph. d'Orleans*, ap. Von Sybel. *Revolutionszeit*, vol. i. p. 152 (Eng. trans.). M. Blanc starts a novel hypothesis, which he supports with some plausible arguments, that *Monsieur* the King's brother, and not the Duke of Orleans, was the usurper in *prospectu* for whom Mirabeau was intriguing. The question is too long to be discussed here; but we must confess that we have not been convinced by M. Blanc's reasoning.

despatched to Paris early in the morning. The way was lined by the inhabitants of the surrounding villages, who came out to gaze upon the strange and melancholy spectacle. From the encumbered state of the roads the procession moved only at a foot-pace, and was often compelled to stop; when those furies in the shape of women would dance round the Royal carriage like cannibals before a feast of human flesh. "We shall not die of hunger," they exclaimed, "for here is the baker, his wife, and the little apprentice!" The King was accompanied by two bishops of his council, who, as the carriage entered the capital, were saluted with cries of "All the bishops to the lamp!" Thus were the Royal family conducted to the Tuileries, which had not been inhabited for a century, and contained no proper accommodation for its new inmates.

The events of October 6th may be said to have decided the fate of the French Monarchy. The King was now virtually a prisoner and a hostage in the hands of the Parisian rabble and its leaders. The Assembly, which soon followed the King to Paris, lost its independence at the same time. It met at first in the apartments of the *archevêché*, on an island of the Seine, between the faubourgs St. Antoine and St. Marceau, the most disturbed districts of Paris; but early in November it was transferred to the *manége* of the Tuileries, a large building running parallel with the terrace of the Feuillants, the site of which now forms part of the Rue de Rivoli. No distinction of seats was now observed; nobles, priests, and commons all sat *pêle-mêle* together. It was plain that there could be no longer any hope of a stable Constitutional Monarchy; and several moderate men withdrew from the Assembly, as Mounier, then its president, Lally Tollendal, and others. The Duke of Orleans, suspected of being the author of the insurrection, was dismissed to London on pretence of a political mission. He arrived in that capital towards the end of October, and was received, both by Court and people, with marked contempt. He was frightened into accepting this mission by the threats of Lafayette.[1] Mirabeau was furious at his departure, and exclaimed, with a vulgar epithet, that he was a poor wretch, and deserved not the trouble that had been taken for him. The Duke returned to France in the summer of 1790, but from this time forward he had lost his popularity.[2]

[1] *Mém. de Lafayette*, ap. Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Rév.* t. iii.

[2] Ferrières, *Mém.* t. i. liv. iv. p. 336 sqq. *Tableau hist. de la Révol.* par le Comte d'Escherny, t. i. p. 237.

At this period the reign of the Palais Royal was supplanted by that of the Jacobins. The Jacobin Club was one of the most portentous features of the Revolution, or rather it may be said to have ultimately become the Revolution itself. It originated at Versailles soon after the meeting of the States-General, and was at first called the *Club des Bretons*, from its having been founded by the forty deputies of Bretagne, who met together to concert their attacks upon the Ministry. It was soon joined by the deputies of Dauphiné and Franche Comté, and gradually by others; as the Abbé Sieyès, the two Lameths, Adrien Duport, the Duke D'Aiguillon, M. de Noailles, and others. When the Assembly was transferred to Paris, the Breton Club hired a large apartment in the Rue St. Honoré, belonging to the preaching Dominican Friars, who were commonly called *Jacobins* because their principal house was in the Rue St. Jacques; and hence the same name was vulgarly given to the club, though they called themselves "the Friends of the Constitution." After a little time, persons who were not deputies were admitted; the debates were thrown open to the public; and as no other qualifications were required for membership than a blind submission to the leaders, and a subscription of twenty-four livres a year, it soon numbered 1,200 members, including several foreigners. There was a *bureau* for the president, a tribune, and stalls round the sides of the chamber. The club held its sittings thrice a week, at seven o'clock in the evening; the order of the day in the Assembly was often debated over night by the Jacobins, and opinions in a certain measure dictated to the deputies. The club disseminated and enforced its principles by means of its *Journal* and *Almanacks*, its hired mob, orators, singers, applauders and hissers in the tribunes of the Assembly. For this last purpose soldiers who had been drummed out of their regiments were principally selected; and in 1790 they consisted of between 700 and 800 men, under the command of a certain Chevalier de St. Louis, to whom they swore implicit obedience. The Jacobins planted affiliated societies in the provinces, which gradually increased to the enormous number of 2,400. At first the club consisted of well-educated and distinguished persons; 400 of them belonged to the Assembly, and may be said to have been the masters of it. The young Duke de Chartres, son of the Duke of Orleans, and afterwards King Louis Philippe, was an active member of the club. By degrees it grew more and more democratic, and became at last a sort of revolutionary Inquisition, and a legion of public

accusers. It was known abroad by the name of the *Propaganda*, and was a terror to all Europe.[1] In the spring of 1790 several members of the club who did not approve its growing violence, as Sieyès, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Ræderer, Bailly, Dupont de Nemours, and others, established what they called the *Club of* 1789, with the view of upholding the original principles of the Revolution. They hired for 24,000 livres a splendid apartment in the Palais Royal, in the house afterwards known as the *Trois Frères Provençaux*, where they dined at a louis d'or a head, after groaning in the Assembly over the miseries of the people. Mirabeau and a few other members continued also to belong to the Jacobins. A certain number of literary men were admitted, among whom may be mentioned Condorcet, Chamfort, and Marmontel. This club also had its journal, of which Condorcet was the editor.[2]

Journalism was also one of the most potent engines of the Revolution. A flood of journals began to be published contemporaneously with, or soon after, the opening of the States-General, as Mirabeau's *Courrier de Provence*, Gorsas' *Courrier de Versailles*, Brissot's *Patriote Français*, Barère's *Point du jour*, &c. The *Révolutions de Paris*, published in the name of the printer, Prudhomme, but edited by Loustalot, the most popular of all the journals, circulated sometimes 200,000 copies. At a rather later period appeared Marat's atrocious and bloodthirsty *Ami du peuple*, Camille Desmoulin's *Courrier de Brabant*, the wittiest, and Fréron's *Orateur du peuple*, the most violent of all the journals, and ultimately Hébert's *Père Duchesne*, perhaps the most infamous of all.[3] For the most part, the whole stock of knowledge of these journalists had been picked up from Voltaire, Rousseau, and the authors of the *Encyclopédie;* but their ignorance was combined with the most ridiculous vanity. Camille Desmoulins openly proclaimed that he had struck out a new branch of commerce—a manufacture of revolutions.[4] Marat seems to have derived his influence chiefly from his atrocious cynicism and bloodthirstiness; for his ability was small, though he had the most unbounded conceit of his own powers.[5] He was born at Boudri, near Neufchâtel, in Switzerland, in 1743. As a

[1] Ferrières, *Mém.* t. ii. p. 117 sqq.; Bertrand de Moleville, *Mém.* t. ii. ch. xxxii.; Toulongeon, t. i. p. 278; Michelet, t. ii. p. 298 sqq.

[2] Barère, *Mém.* t. i. p. 293; Ferrières, *Mém.* t. ii.

[3] Michelet, t. i. p. 252 sq.

[4] *Révol. de France*, ap. Granier de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 403.

[5] Thus, in one of the numbers of his *Ami du peuple*, he says: "Je crois avoir épuisé toutes les combinaisons de l'esprit humain, sur la morale, la philosophie, et la politique."—Ap. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. ii. p. 386.

child he displayed a sort of precocious talent combined with a morose perversity; and in manhood the same disposition was shown by his attacks upon everybody who had gained a reputation. Thus he attempted to upset the philosophy of Newton and disputed his theory of optics, which he appears not to have comprehended, as well as Franklin's theory of electricity; and in a book which he published in reply to Helvetius, he spoke with the greatest contempt of Locke, Condillac, Malebranche, and Voltaire. His own writings abound with commonplace, which he abandons only to become absurd. He spent some time in England, during part of which he seems to have been employed as an usher at Warrington. In 1775 he published, at Edinburgh, a work in English, entitled the *Chains of Slavery*, which indicated his future course. On his return from England he obtained the place of veterinary surgeon in the stables of the Count d'Artois, which he abandoned on the breaking out of the Revolution to become an editor. The bitterness of his literary failures seems to have excited the natural spleen, envy, and malignity of his temper to an excess bordering upon madness. Cowardly as well as cruel, while he hid himself in garrets and cellars, he filled his journal with personal attacks and denunciations, and recommended not only murder but torture, as the cutting off of thumbs, burying alive, &c.[1]

After the removal of the King to Paris the political atmosphere became somewhat calmer, though disturbances sometimes broke out on the old subject of the supply of bread. The populace seemed astonished that the presence of the King had not rendered that article more abundant; and about a fortnight after his arrival, they put to death a baker named François, on the charge of being a forestaller, and paraded his head through the city. But justice, this time, did not altogether sleep. Martial law was proclaimed; and a market-porter, who had taken part in the outrage, was executed, to the great disgust of the populace, who exclaimed: "What liberty have we? Shall we not then be permitted to hang anybody?"[2]

The Assembly was divided into various committees of war, marine, jurisprudence, &c., of which the committee charged with drawing up the Constitution was alone permanent. Its members were Mirabeau, Target, Duport, Chapelier, Desmeuniers, Talleyrand, Barnave, Lameth, and Sieyès. The Abbé Sieyès, whose

[1] Michelet, *Hist. de la Revol.* t. iii. p. 119.
[2] Toulongeon, *Hist. de France*, t. i. p. 168.

studious and taciturn habits, and abrupt, sententious way of speaking had procured for him a reputation for wisdom which he scarcely deserved, was one of the most active members of the committee. It was he who presented the project for dividing France into eighty-three departments. The question of the revenue, the real cause for summoning the States-General, seemed almost neglected. Necker had attempted to negotiate two loans, but they failed; partly because the Assembly reduced the proposed interest too low, and partly from a want of confidence on the part of capitalists. Necker now proposed an extraordinary contribution of a fourth of all incomes, or an income-tax of twenty-five per cent., for one year. He accompanied the project with an earnest appeal to all good citizens to contribute to the necessities of the State. This appeal was cheerfully responded to by people of all ranks. The members of the Assembly deposited at the door their silver shoe-buckles; the King and Queen sent their plate to the Mint; Necker himself placed bank notes for 100,000 francs on the President's bureau; labouring men offered half their earnings, the women their rings and trinkets; even the very children parted with their playthings. Such expedients, however, could afford only a temporary and precarious relief. In this extremity the property of the Church offered a vast and tempting resource. Such property, it was argued, could be seized, or rather resumed, without injustice; it had been erected only for a national purpose, and the State might appropriate it if that purpose could be fulfilled in another way.

The decree for the abolition of tithes had already passed among the offerings made on August 4th, in spite of the arguments of the Abbé Sieyès, who pointed out that tithes, as a charge upon land, had been allowed for in its purchase, and that to abolish them unconditionally was to make a present to the landed proprietors of an annual rent of 120,000,000 francs, or near 5,000,000*l.* sterling. Yet Mirabeau, and the greater part of the Assembly, either could not, or would not, understand this simple question of arithmetic; while Sieyès, who was the real democrat, by preventing the rich from being favoured at the expense of the poor, who would have to contribute to the new tax proposed for the maintenance of the clergy, lost much of his popularity by reminding the Assembly of common sense and common justice.[1] Well might he exclaim: "They want to be free, and know not how to be just!" At the same time, Buzot, afterwards a member of the Gironde, had pro-

[1] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 16 sqq.

posed to seize the Church lands and other property.[1] This proposition, which was supported by Mirabeau, was not then attended to, but was renewed a few months later by the Bishop of Autun; and, after violent debates, was finally decreed by a large majority, November 2nd, 1789.[2] The confiscation of ecclesiastical property was very ill received by the peasantry, with whom the Church was popular, and in some districts led to strife and bloodshed. The discontent was increased by the prevalent agricultural distress, which was at its height in the summer of 1790, and was particularly felt among the small farmers of the central provinces.

By this confiscation, to which were added the domains of the Crown, except those reserved for the recreation of the King, a large national fund was created. But there was a difficulty in realizing it. A sum of 400,000,000 francs was required for 1790 and the following year; yet it was almost impossible to effect sales to so large an amount, even at great sacrifices. The clergy made a last attempt to save their property by offering a loan of the sum required; but it was refused on the ground that it implied their recognition as proprietors. To meet this difficulty, the Finance Committee resolved, in the spring of 1790, to sell certain portions of the newly-acquired national property to the municipalities of Paris and other towns. These purchases were to be paid for in paper guaranteed by those bodies; such paper to have a legal circulation, and all anterior contracts to be liquidated in it. Such was the origin of the currency called *assignats*. The issue of these notes was at first regulated by the amount of property actually sold; but this precaution being subsequently neglected, naturally produced a rapid fall in the value of the new currency. One of the results of this financial measure was to create a large number of small landed proprietors. Ecclesiastics were now paid by the Government; the incomes of the higher dignitaries of the Church were reduced; while those of the *curés*, or parish priests, were augmented. In February, 1790, monasteries were abolished and monastic vows suppressed.

These attacks upon the Church were accompanied with others upon the Parliament. Alexander de Lameth had proposed and carried a decree, November 3rd, 1789, that the Parliaments should remain in vacation till further orders, and that meanwhile their functions should be discharged by the *Chambres des vacations*. Some of them endeavoured to resist, but were silenced by the

[1] Michelet, t. ii. p. 560 note.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. iii. p. 256.

Assembly; and from this time they virtually ceased to exist, though not yet legally abolished.

We must here also record the reforms in the municipality of Paris, a body which played a leading part in the Revolution. By an ordinance of Louis XVI., April 13th, 1789, Paris, which had hitherto consisted of twenty-one quarters, was, with a view to the elections for the States-General, divided into sixty *arrondissemens*, or districts; and this division was adopted as the basis of the municipal organization, established spontaneously after the taking of the Bastille. But as several of these districts had promoted disturbances, the Constituent Assembly, in order to break the concert between them, made a new division into forty-eight Sections, by a law of June 27th, 1790. This arrangement, however, ultimately proved no better than the former one. It had been ordained that the Sections should not remain assembled after the elections of deputies were concluded; but this wise provision was rendered nugatory by another, authorizing their assembly on the requisition of any eight of them. To exercise this right, a permanent committee of sixteen persons was established in each Section; and thus were provided forty-eight focuses of perpetual agitation; a circumstance which produced the most fatal effects upon the Revolution.[1]

Early in 1790 occurred the obscure plot of the Marquis de Favras, the object of which seems to have been to assassinate Lafayette and Necker, and to carry off the King to Peronne. The plot was to be carried out by means of 1,200 horse, supported by an army of 20,000 Swiss and 12,000 Germans, and by raising several provinces; but it was detected. Favras was tried and condemned by the Châtelet, and hanged, February 19th, 1790, affording the first instance of equality in the mode of punishment. Favras forbore to make any confessions, and the whole matter is involved in mystery.[2]

After the failure of the Orleans conspiracy, and the withdrawal of the Duke to England, Mirabeau, ever profligate and needy, finding all resources from that quarter cut off, had determined on selling himself to the Court. Mirabeau's connection with it was

[1] Mortimer Terneau, *Hist. de la Terreur*, t. i. p. 25 sqq. and note iii.

[2] Toulongeon, t. i. p. 181. We must confess our inability to follow M. Louis Blanc's attempts to connect the Count of Provence and Mirabeau with this conspiracy. In support of his views he adverts to a MS. letter of Monsieur in the possession of Lord Houghton, addressed to some unknown person, and which, he thinks, was that found on Favras when arrested. (*Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 426.) But on referring to it at p. 169, we find that it is dated November 1st, 1790, and Favras was hanged in the preceding February.

effected through his friend, the Count de la Marck, who represented to Count Mercy, the Austrian Ambassador, the friend of Marie Antoinette, and confidential correspondent of her mother, Maria Theresa,[1] the real state of Mirabeau's feelings. The French Queen entertained for Mirabeau the bitterest aversion, as the author of the attack of the 5th of October; but she had long wished to come to an understanding with some of the leaders of the Assembly, and Mercy succeeded in appeasing her resentment. There was to be no question of the restoration of the ancient *Régime;* the safety of the Royal family seems to have been all that was contemplated.[2] Mirabeau offered to manage the Assembly, which he called "a restive ass," in the interests of the Court,[3] and drew up the scheme of a Ministry, in which he himself was to be included; but his conduct had already begun to be suspected, and a motion was made and carried in the Assembly that no deputy should be capable of holding office.[4] Mirabeau, nevertheless, continued his connection with the Court, abandoned his former humble lodging, and set up a splendid establishment. His debts, amounting to 208,000 livres, were to be paid; he was to receive a monthly pension of 6,000 livres; and at the end of the session, if he had served the King well, a sum of one million livres. But, to insure his engagement for the payment of his debts, a kind of tutor was to be set over him; and a priest, M. de Fontanges, Archbishop of Toulouse, undertook this strange office![5]

It was resolved to celebrate the anniversary of the capture of the Bastille by a grand federative fête in the Champ de Mars, at which deputations from all the departments were to assist; and as the labour of 12,000 workmen sufficed not to prepare in time this vast amphitheatre, they were assisted by citizens of all ranks, ages, and sexes. A few score vagabond foreigners, headed by a half-crazed Prussian baron, styling himself Anacharsis Clootz, appeared at the bar of the National Assembly as "an embassy from all the nations of the universe," to demand places for a large number of foreigners desirous of assisting at the sublime spectacle of the Federation. This demand is said to have inspired the Assembly with profound enthusiasm, though many of the members

[1] Their correspondence, published by the Chevalier d'Arneth, throws a good deal of light on the secret history of the French Court a little before the Revolution.

[2] See Von Sybel, vol. i. p. 212 (Eng. transl.).

[3] See *Corresp. entre le Comte de Mirabeau et le Comte de la Marck*, t. i. p. 387. This correspondence affords the most convincing proofs of Mirabeau's corruption.

[4] *Moniteur*, Séance de Novembre 7ème, 1789, ap. Blanc, t. iii. p. 401.

[5] *Correspondance, &c.* t. i. p. 162 sqq.

could not refrain from laughter on perceiving among these ambassadors their discarded domestics, who, in dresses borrowed from the theatres and fripperies, personated, for twelve francs, Turks, Poles, Arabians, Chinese, and other characters. In the excitement of the moment, the Assembly decreed the abolition of all titles of honour, of armorial bearings, and liveries. A motion that the title of *Seigneur* should be retained by Princes of the Blood Royal was opposed by Lafayette, and lost.[1]

On July 14th the deputies from the departments ranged themselves under their respective banners, as well as the representatives of the army and of the National Guard. The Bishop of Autun officiated in Pontifical robes at an altar in the middle of the arena; at each of its corners stood a hundred priests in their white *aubes*, with three coloured girdles. The King and the President of the Assembly occupied, in front of the altar, thrones which had little to distinguish them from each other. Behind were their respective attendants, the members of the Assembly, and, in a sort of balcony, the Queen and Royal family. Lafayette, as Commandant of the National Guard, first took the oath, next, the President of the Assembly, and then the King. His oath ran: "I, citizen, King of the French, swear to the nation to employ all the power delegated to me by the constitutional law of the State to uphold the Constitution, and enforce the execution of the laws." The Queen, lifting up the Dauphin in her arms, pledged his future obedience to the oath. The ceremony, so calculated, by its dramatic effect, to please the French, was concluded with a hymn of thanksgiving and the discharge of artillery. "Such," says a French historian, "was this memorable day, which, by its formalities, its grandeur, and its simplicity, may be compared with anything that the majesty of the ancient Republics has left us as a model."[2] A medal was struck in commemoration of the event, which was also celebrated by *fêtes* that lasted several days. Among the most remarkable of them was a ball in the ruins of the Bastille, in which former abode of grief and suffering might be read the inscription, *Içi l'on danse.*

But the nation thus newly constituted seemed already hastening to dissolution. All the springs of government appeared relaxed and distorted. Necker, disgusted at seeing his functions assumed by the Assembly, retired into Switzerland (September, 1790). The

[1] Toulongeon, *Hist. de France*, t. i. p. 217 sq.; *Hist. Parl.* t. vi. p. 280 sqq.; Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 187.

[2] Toulongeon, *ibid.* p. 224.

communication in which he notified his retirement was received with coldness and silence; the deputies, with marked contempt, passed to the order of the day. It was evident that his public career was closed. The words *liberty* and *equality*, ill understood, had turned every head; had penetrated even into the army, and filled it with insubordination. In some regiments the officers had been forced to fly, in others they had been massacred. In August a revolt of the troops stationed at Nanci had assumed a most serious character. General De Bouillé was compelled to march against them from Metz, and the mutiny was not quelled without a sharp engagement and considerable bloodshed.

The Church was also in a state of disturbance. Not content with depriving the clergy of their property, the Assembly proceeded to attack their consciences, by decreeing the civil constitution of the clergy, July 12th, 1790, which abolished all the ancient forms and institutions of the Church. The title of *archbishop*, as well as all canonicates, prebends, chapters, priories, abbeys, convents, &c., were suppressed; bishops and *curés* were no longer to be nominated by the King, but to be chosen by the people. To these and other momentous changes in the constitution of the Church, the Pope refused his sanction; but by a decree of November 27th, 1790, the Assembly required the clergy to take an oath of fidelity to the nation, the law, and the King, and to maintain the Constitution. This oath they were to take within a week, on pain of deprivation. The King, before assenting to this measure, wished to procure the consent of the Pope, but was persuaded not to wait for it, and gave his sanction, December 3rd. Mirabeau, by an apparently violent speech against the clergy, was, it is said, in reality endeavouring to procure them a milder lot; but it completely destroyed his good understanding with the King. Louis, whose religious feelings were very strong, was more hurt by these attacks upon the Church than even by those directed against his own prerogative. They induced him to turn his thoughts towards aid from abroad, and shortly afterwards he began to correspond with General De Bouillé, respecting an escape to the frontier.

Of 300 prelates and priests who had seats in the Assembly, those who sat on the right unanimously refused to take the oath, while those who sat on the left anticipated the day appointed for that purpose. Out of 138 archbishops and bishops, only four consented to swear: Talleyrand, Loménie de Brienne (now Archbishop of Sens), the Bishop of Orleans, and the Bishop of Viviers. The

oath was also refused by the great majority of the *curés* and vicars, amounting, it is said, to 50,000. Hence arose the distinction of *prêtres sermentés* and *insermentés*, or sworn and non-juring priests. The brief of Pius VI., forbidding the oath, was burnt at the Palais Royal, as well as a manikin representing the Pope himself in his pontificals. Many of the deprived ecclesiastics refused to vacate their functions, declared their successors intruders, and the sacraments they administered null, and excommunicated all who recognized and obeyed them.[1]

The death of Mirabeau, April 2nd, 1791, deprived the Court of a partisan in the Assembly, though it may well be doubted whether his exertions could have saved the Monarchy. He fell a victim to his profligate habits, assisted probably by the violent exertions he had recently made in the Assembly, in a question concerning the private interests of his friend, the Count de la Marck.[2] He displayed his sensualism in his last moments, by desiring the attendants to remove all the apparatus of a sick chamber, to bring perfumes and flowers, to dress his hair, to let him hear the harmonious strains of music. His treachery was not yet publicly known, and his death was honoured with all the marks of public mourning. The theatres were closed and all the usual entertainments forbidden. He was honoured with a sumptuous funeral at the public expense, to which, says a contemporary historian, nothing but grief was wanting.[3] In fact, to most of the members of the Assembly, eclipsed by his splendid talents, and overawed by his reckless audacity, his death was a relief. His remains were carried to the Pantheon, but were afterwards cast out to make room for those of Marat. After Mirabeau's death, Duport, Barnave, and Lameth reigned supreme in the Assembly, and Robespierre became more prominent.[4]

The King, as we have said, had now begun to fix his hopes on foreign intervention. The injuries inflicted by the decrees of the Assembly on August 4th, 1789, on several Princes of the Empire, through their possessions in Alsace, Franche Comté, and Lorraine, might afford a pretext for a rupture between the German Confederation and France. The Palatine House of Deux Ponts, the Houses of Würtemberg, Darmstadt, Baden, Salm Salm, and others had

[1] Barruel, *Hist. du Clergé pendant la Révol.* t. i. p. 61 sq.; Ferrières, *Mém.* t. ii. liv. viii.; Bertrand de Moleville, *Annales, &c.* t. iii. ch. 35.

[2] On returning to La Marck's house, he exclaimed, throwing himself on a sofa, "Votre cause est gagné, et moi je suis mort." See *Correspondance entre Mirabeau et La Marck*, t. iii. p. 92 sq.

[3] Toulongeon, t. i. p. 274.

[4] *Mémoires de Mirabeau*, t. viii. liv. x.; Lacretelle, *Hist. de France*, t. viii. p. 234.

possessions and lordships in those provinces; and were secured in the enjoyment of their rights and privileges by the treaties which placed the provinces under the sovereignty of France. The German prelates, injured by the civil constitution of the clergy, were among the first to complain. By this act the Elector of Mentz was deprived of his metropolitan rights over the bishoprics of Strasburg and Spires; the Elector of Trèves of those over Metz, Toul, Verdun, Nanci, and St. Diez. The Bishops of Strasburg and Bâle lost their diocesan rights in Alsace.[1] Some of these princes and nobles had called upon the Emperor and the German body in January, 1790, for protection against the arbitrary acts of the National Assembly. This appeal had been favourably entertained, both by the Emperor Joseph II. and by the King of Prussia; and though the Assembly offered suitable indemnities, they were haughtily refused. On the other hand, the Assembly having annulled seignorial rights and privileges throughout the French dominions, could not consistently make exceptions. The Emperor, besides the alarm which he felt in common with other absolute Sovereigns at the French revolutionary *propaganda*, could not forget that the Queen of France was his sister; and he was also swayed by his Minister, Prince Kaunitz, whose grand stroke of policy—an intimate alliance between Austria and the House of Bourbon—was altogether incompatible with the French Revolution. The Spanish and Italian Bourbons were naturally inclined to support their relative, Louis XVI. In October, 1790, Louis had written to request the King of Spain not to attend to any act done in his name, unless confirmed by letters from himself.[2] The King of Sardinia, connected by intermarriages with the French Bourbons, had also family interests to maintain. Catharine II. of Russia had witnessed, with humiliation and alarm, the fruits of the philosophy which she had patronized, and was opposed to the new order of things in France. The King of Prussia, governed by the counsels of Hertzberg, the inveterate enemy of Austria, though disposed to assist the French King, had at first insisted on the condition that Louis should break with Austria, and conclude an intimate alliance with the House of Brandenburg,[3] a proposition which was, of course, rejected. But, in April, 1791, Hertzberg retired from the Ministry, leaving the field open to Bischofswerder,[4] the friend of Austria, and the policy which had inspired

[1] Garden, *Traités*, t. v. p. 152 sq.
[2] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 78.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 98 sq.
[4] Bischofswerder, and his brother mystics, or *illuminati*, exercised a great influence over the weak-minded Frederick

the Convention of Reichenbach once more prevailed. Thus all the materials existed for an extensive coalition against French democracy.

In this posture of affairs the Count d'Artois, accompanied by Calonne, who served him as a sort of Minister, and by the Count de Durfort, who had been despatched from the French Court, had a conference with the Emperor, now Leopold II., at Mantua, in May, 1791, in which it was agreed that, by the following July, Austria should march 35,000 men towards the frontiers of Flanders, the German Circles 15,000 towards Alsace; the Swiss 15,000 towards the Lyonnais; the King of Sardinia, 15,000 towards Dauphiné; while Spain was to hold 20,000 in readiness in Catalonia. This agreement, for there was not, as some writers have supposed, any formal treaty, was drawn up by Calonne, and amended with the Emperor's own hand. But the large force to be thus assembled was intended only as a threatening demonstration, and hostilities were not to be actually commenced without the sanction of a congress.[1] The flight attempted a few weeks after by Louis XVI. was not at all connected with this conference. Such a project was, indeed, mentioned at Mantua, but it was discouraged by the Emperor, as well as by the Count d'Artois and Calonne. The King's situation was become intolerably irksome. He was, to all intents and purposes, a prisoner at Paris. A trip, which he wished to make to St. Cloud during the Easter of 1791, was denounced at the Jacobin Club as a pretext for flight; and when he attempted to leave the Tuileries, April 18th, the *tocsin* was rung, his carriage was surrounded by the mob, and he was compelled to return to the Palace. On the following day Louis appeared in the Assembly, pointed out how important it was, on constitutional grounds, that his actions should be free; reiterated his assurances of attachment to public liberty and the new Constitution, and insisted on his journey to St. Cloud. But the President was silent on this head, though the Assembly received the King with respect.[2]

A few days after thus protesting against the restraint to which he was subjected, the leaders of the Revolution, who appear to have suspected his negotiations abroad, exacted that he should address a circular to his ambassadors at foreign Courts, in which he entirely approved the Revolution, assumed the title of "Re-

William II. by their pretensions to supernatural power. They pretended to evoke Jesus Christ and Moses, to show the shadow of Cæsar upon the wall, &c. Ségur, *Tableau Politique, &c.* t. i. p. 82.

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 110 sq.; Bertrand de Moleville, *Annales*, t. iv. ch. 11; Lacretelle, t. viii. p. 239 sqq.

[2] *Moniteur*, Séance du 19ème Avril, 1791.

storer of French liberty," and utterly repudiated the notion that he was not free and master of his actions.[1] The Powers to whom the note was addressed, knew, however, perfectly well that he did not love the Constitution; and, indeed, he immediately despatched secret agents to Cologne and Brussels with letters for the King of Prussia and for Maria Christina, governess of the Austrian Netherlands, in which he notified that any sanction he might give to the decrees of the Assembly was to be reputed null; that his pretended approval of the Constitution was to be interpreted in an opposite sense, and that the more strongly he should seem to adhere to it, the more he should desire to be liberated from the captivity in which he was held.[2]

Louis soon after resolved on his unfortunate flight to the army of the Marquis de Bouillé at Montmédy. He appears to have been urged to it by the Baron de Breteuil, in concert with the Count de Mercy, at Brussels, who falsely alleged that it was the Emperor's wish.[3] Marie Antoinette, as well as De Bouillé, strongly opposed the project, but at last reluctantly yielded to the King's representations.[4]

Our limits will not permit us to enter into the interesting details of the flight to Varennes.[5] Suffice it to say, that having, after some hairbreadth escapes, succeeded in quitting Paris in a travelling berlin, June 20th, they reached St. Menehould in safety. But here the King was recognized by Drouet, the son of the postmaster, who, mounting his horse, pursued the Royal fugitives to Varennes, raised an alarm, and caused them to be captured when they already thought themselves out of danger. In consequence of their being rather later than was expected, the military preparations which had been made for their protection entirely failed. The news of the King's flight filled Paris with consternation. When the news of his arrest arrived, the Assembly despatched Barnave, Latour-Maubourg, and Pétion to conduct him and his family back to Paris. In discharging this office, Pétion, who appears to have been a solemn coxcomb,[6] dis-

[1] The Circular, dated April 25rd, 1791, is in the *Hist. Parl.* t. ix.

[2] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 106 sqq.

[3] *Ibid.* t. i. p. 115.

[4] Weber, *Mém.* t. ii. ch. iv. p. 315 sqq.; *Mém.* de Bouillé, ch. x. sq.

[5] One of the most authentic accounts of it will be found in Weber's *Mémoires*, t. ii. ch. iv., drawn up by M. de Fontanges, Archbishop of Toulouse, from information furnished by the Queen herself. The English reader will find an interesting narrative of it in Croker's *Essays on the French Revolution*, Essay iii.

[6] Pétion wrote an account of the journey back, which was found among his papers, and has been published by M. Mortimer Terneau, in his *Hist. de la Terreur*, t. i. note 5. Pétion is here condemned by his own mouth. Among other things he is vain and insolent enough to imagine that the princess Elizabeth had fallen in love with him during this miserable journey.

played a vulgar brutality, combined with insufferable conceit; while Barnave, touched by the affliction and bearing of the Royal fugitives, won their confidence and regard by his considerate attention.[1] Notices had been posted up in Paris that those who applauded the King should be horsewhipped, and that those who insulted him should be hanged; hence he was received on entering the capital with a dead silence. The streets, however, were traversed without accident to the Tuileries, but as the Royal party were alighting, a rush was made upon them by some ruffians, and they were with difficulty saved from injury. The King's brother, the Count of Provence, who had fled at the same time by a different route, escaped safely to Brussels.

This time the King's intention to fly could not be denied; he had, indeed, himself proclaimed it by sending to the Assembly a manifest, in which he explained his reasons for it, declared that he did not intend to quit the Kingdom, expressed his desire to restore liberty and establish a Constitution, but annulled all that he had done during the last two years. Amongst many well-founded complaints, he condescended to allude to his poverty, although he had a civil list of twenty-five millions; and of the inconvenience of the Tuileries, where, he said, he had not the comforts of a private person in easy circumstances.[2] In judging the conduct of the Assembly at this crisis, we must consider the feelings with which the idea of the King's flight inspired the whole French nation. His intrigues with D'Artois and the Emigrants were more than suspected, and it was thought that he would introduce a vast foreign army and restore the ancient *régime* by force and bloodshed. The leaders of the clubs trembled for their necks; the artisans foresaw the loss of the State wages; the peasantry dreaded the restoration of feudalism; the burghers pictured to themselves the return of the insolent *noblesse;* the army beheld, *in prospectu,* a return to low pay and the whip, and commissions monopolized by the nobles; the purchasers of ecclesiastical property saw their new acquisitions slipping from their grasp; while even disinterested patriots revolted at the idea of seeing France trampled on by foreign Powers, and stripped, perhaps, of some of her provinces.[3] The King, after his return, was

[1] That Barnave, however, as commonly related, was induced to change his politics during this journey, by the compassion which he felt for the Queen, is only a little piece of biographical effect. He had been going over several months before. *Lettres* de Montmorin, ap. Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 258, Anm. (vol. i. p. 301, Eng. tr.).

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. x. p. 269; cf. Michelet, t. iii. p. 19.

[3] Von Sybel, i. 306 (Eng. tr.).

provisionally suspended from his functions by a decree of the Assembly, June 25th. Guards were placed over him and the Queen; the gardens of the Tuileries assumed the appearance of a camp; sentinels were stationed on the roof of the Palace, and even at the Queen's bedchamber. Three commissaries, Tronchet, d'André, and Duport, were appointed to examine the King and Queen. The Duke of Orleans was talked of for Regent, but he repudiated the idea in a letter addressed to some of the revolutionary journals. Barnave, who had adopted the policy of Mirabeau, though with purer motives, namely, to arrest the Revolution, to save the Monarchy, and govern in conjunction with the Queen,[1] suggested to Louis and Marie Antoinette what answers they should give to the questions put to them. While things were in this state, the Marquis de Bouillé addressed a highly intemperate and injudicious letter to the Assembly, threatening that if the least harm was done to the King or Queen, he would conduct the army to Paris, and that not one stone of that city should be left upon another; but this effusion only excited the laughter of the deputies.[2]

[1] Michelet, *ibid.* p. 179.

[2] Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 44 and App.

CHAPTER LIV.

FROM the period of the King's flight to Varennes must be dated the first decided appearance of a Republican party in France. During his absence the Assembly had been virtually sovereign, and hence men took occasion to say, "You see the public peace has been maintained; affairs have gone on in the usual way in the King's absence."[1] The chief advocates of a Republic were Brissot, Condorcet, and the recently-established club of the *Cordéliers*, so called from its meeting in a former convent of that order. This club, an offset from the Jacobins, contained all the most violent promoters of a revolution. Brissot began to disseminate Republican opinions in his journal, and the arch-democrat, Thomas Payne, who was now at Paris, also endeavoured to excite the populace against the King. The Jacobin Club had not yet gone this length; they were for bringing Louis XVI. to trial and deposing him, but for maintaining the Monarchy. Robespierre, a leading member of the club, who probably disliked to see the initiative taken by Condorcet and Brissot, in an equivocal speech supported the Constitution.[2] He did not yet venture openly to speak of a Republic, but he called upon the Assembly to bring the King and Queen to trial; and by whining complaints against his colleagues, whose daggers, he said, were pointed at his breast on account of his frankness and liberality, he won the sympathies of the Jacobins. Marat was more outspoken. He proposed the appointment of a military tribune, who should make a short end of all traitors, among whom he and his faction included Lafayette, Bailly, Barnave, the Lameths, and other leaders of the Constitutionalists.[3] But for the present the party prevailed who were both for upholding the Monarchy and retaining Louis XVI. The Jacobins resolved to get up a petition to the Assembly, inviting them to suspend their decision till the eighty-three departments should have been consulted, well knowing that, from their numerous affiliations, a vote for the King's

[1] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. i. p. 33. [2] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. v. p. 461.
[3] Von Sybel, i. p. 311 (Eng. tr.).

deposition would be carried. The leaders of the Constitutionalists now separated from the Jacobins, and, with their party, which included all the members of the Assembly belonging to that club, except ten or twelve, established the Club of the *Feuillants*. This name was derived from their occupying an ancient convent of that order, founded by Henry III., an immense building in the Rue St. Honoré, adjoining on one side the *Manège*, where the Assembly sat.

The Jacobins gave notice to all the patriotic societies that their petition would be signed on the altar of the Federation in the Champ de Mars on July 17th. On the evening of the 16th, the Assembly, by decreeing that the Constitutional Charter, when finished, should be presented to Louis XVI. for acceptance, having implicitly pronounced his re-establishment, Camille Desmoulins and Marat openly incited the populace to acts of violence against the deputies. Marat pointed out by name Sieyès, Le Chapelier, Duport, Target, Thouret, Barnave, and others; and exhorted the people to impale them alive, and to expose their bodies three days on the battlements of the Senate House.[1] The Government gave notice that the proposed petition was illegal, and that the signing of it would be prevented by military force. Nevertheless a vast multitude congregated in the Champ de Mars on the 17th: and, as it was a Sunday, the crowd was augmented by many holiday people, women and children. The petition appears to have received many thousand signatures. Meanwhile martial law had been proclaimed; the National Guards arrived, and having been assailed by the mob with volleys of stones, and even with pistol-shots, fired upon the people. Many persons were killed or wounded, and the crowd was dispersed. The leading ultra democrats displayed the most abject cowardice. Marat hid himself in a cellar; Danton withdrew into the country; Robespierre was afraid to sleep at home; Desmoulin suspended the publication of his journal. By this decisive act the Constitutionalists established for awhile their authority; but Lafayette and Bailly lost their popularity, and the Jacobins were not long in regaining their ascendency.[2]

The constitutional party, in absolving the King, appears to have been a good deal influenced by the attitude assumed at this time by foreign States, though this circumstance is ignored by the French historians of the Revolution. Several of the European

[1] *L'Ami du peuple*, No. 514, ap. L.Blanc, t. v. p. 475.
[2] Ferrières, *Mém.* t. iii. p. 70 sqq.

Powers had begun to manifest a lively sympathy for Louis. Gustavus III. of Sweden, then at Aix-la-Chapelle, had made a vigorous declaration against the outrages to which the French King was subjected after his attempted flight, and had directed his Ambassador to break off all intercourse with the Ministers of the Assembly. Eight of the Swiss Cantons had forbidden their troops in the pay of France to take any oath except to Louis XVI. The King of Spain had addressed a memoir to the Assembly, calling upon it to respect Louis's dignity and liberty. The Emperor Leopold, on learning the capture of the French King, had addressed a circular from Padua to the principal Sovereigns of Europe, calling upon them to demand his liberation, and to declare that they would avenge any further attempt on the freedom, honour, and safety of Louis, his Queen, and the Royal family.[1] Many of the principal Courts declined to receive a French Ambassador so long as the King should be under constraint.[2] The leaders of the Revolution appear to have made some military preparations to resist this dictation; but finding themselves unable to sustain a war, they resolved to avoid, or, at all events, to postpone it; a result to which the discordant views of the different parties contributed. It has even been affirmed that, towards the end of 1791, it might have been possible to regulate the political state of France by means of a Congress, aided by the Constitutional party.[3]

No Sovereign was more zealous in Louis's cause than Frederick William II. of Prussia, who must be regarded as the very Agamemnon of the Coalition. After the French King's arrest, he despatched Bischofswerder to the Emperor in Italy, and a preliminary treaty between these two Sovereigns was signed, July 25th, to be converted into a defensive alliance so soon as Austria should have concluded a peace with the Turks. The accession of the Czarina was expected; and in fact these events appear to have hastened the Peace of Galatz between Catharine and the Porte, August 11th. The impetuous Gustavus III. was for immediate

[1] It is said that at the date of this circular, a treaty for the partition of France was concluded between the Emperor, the King of Prussia, the King of Spain, and the emigrant French princes. The treaty is in Martens' *Recueil*, t. v. p. 5 (from the *Coll. of State Papers*); but it is very apocryphal; and still more so the pretended accession of Great Britain and Holland in March, 1792. It was probably only a project, afterwards superseded by the Treaty of Vienna. Garden, t. v. p. 160 sq.

[2] Garden, *ibid.* p. 159. Austria and Prussia, in their joint note to the Danish Court, May 12th, 1792, take credit for having procured the release of Louis in the preceding summer, as well as the establishment of his inviolability, and of a Constitutional Monarchy. *Ibid.* p. 211.

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 116 sqq. 146, &c.

action. He engaged to land 16,000 men at Ostend, requested George III. to furnish 12,000 Hanoverians, to be paid by the French Princes, and took De Bouillé into his service, who pointed out how easily France might be invaded. The French Constitutionalists exerted themselves to avert an interference that would upset their whole policy. Barnave, Duport, and the Lameths addressed a letter to the Count d'Artois, begging him to return when the King should have accepted the Constitution; and it was forwarded to that Prince by Louis's order. The Constitutionalists also assured the Emperor that their object was to save the throne.[1]

At this juncture the Emperor and the King of Prussia met at Pillnitz, a residence of the Elector of Saxony on the Elbe, principally for the purpose of considering the affairs of Poland, which then occupied the attention of the Eastern Powers; but the state of France was also debated, and the Count d'Artois, attended by Calonne, obtruded himself on the Conference. This Prince, with a view to gain the Emperor, had offered to cede Lorraine; but the scheme which he drew up for the government of France, by which his elder brother, Monsieur, was to be declared Regent, and the King completely set aside, filled Leopold with disgust. He was chiefly actuated by his wishes for the safety of the King and Queen, his relatives, and was inclined to listen to the representations of his sister, Marie Antoinette, who deprecated civil war and an invasion of the Emigrants. She recommended that the King should accept the Constitution, and that the European Powers should combine in demanding that the King should be invested with the authority necessary for the government of France and the safety of Europe.[2] The Emperor and the King of Prussia, in their answer to D'Artois, dated August 27th, declined his plans for the government of France; they sanctioned the peaceable residence of emigrants in their dominions, but declared against armed intervention unless the co-operation of all the European Powers should be obtained. And as it was well known that England was not inclined to interfere, this declaration was a mere *brutum fulmen* meant to intimidate the Parisian democrats, but fitted rather to irritate than to alarm the French.[3] England had at this period declared for a strict neutrality. Public

[1] Bouillé, *Mém.* ch. xii. p. 274; *Corr. entre Mirabeau et La Marck*, t. iii. p. 163 sqq.; L. Blanc, t. v. p. 29.

[2] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, i. 366 (Eng. trans.).

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. i. pp. 137, 143. Von Sybel, *ibid.* p. 364.

opinion was against a war, and Pitt himself advocated the policy of non-intervention in Continental affairs.[1]

The labours of the Constituent Assembly were now drawing to a close. On September 3rd, 1791, the Act of the Constitution was presented to the King, who had been restored to the exercise of his functions. Louis notified his acceptance of it in a letter addressed to the Assembly, September 13th, and on the following day he appeared in the Chamber to confirm it with an oath. A few weeks after, he wrote to his two brothers informing them of what he had done, and calling upon them to acquiesce. Leopold, on hearing of the King's acceptance of the Constitution, announced to the Powers that the necessity for a Coalition was for the present at an end. The new Constitution was as liberal as the French might reasonably have desired; but as it lasted scarcely a year it is not necessary to enter into any lengthened examination of it. Its chief, and, it may be added, its most lasting merit was the destruction of ancient abuses. Feudalism and its exclusive privileges were abolished; the abuses which spring from an arbitrary government, such as *lettres de cachet*, &c., were reformed; uniformity of taxation was established, and the power of the purse vested in the representatives of the people; the monopolies of trade corporations, *maîtrises* and *jurandes*, as well as *corvées* and all the fetters which shackle manufacture and agriculture, were suppressed; the admission to civil offices and military commands was thrown open; the freedom of religious worship recognized; barbarous punishments were done away with; juries introduced in place of the suppressed Parliaments, and, in short, all the English forms of administering justice adopted. But there were some things which the Assembly did, and others they omitted to do, which rendered nugatory all their labours. They had, indeed, recognized an hereditary monarchy, and declared the person of the King inviolable; but they had not given him the means of maintaining himself on the throne; they had stripped him of his prerogatives, deprived him of the support of the clergy and nobles, placed him face to face with a wild democracy, and established no strong executive power which might control its excesses. Of the fall of their new Constitution by democratic violence they seem to have entertained no fear. The apprehensions of the Assembly, as well as of the people, were directed only against the aristocracy; whence an able writer on the Revolution has drawn a proof "how

[1] *Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury*, vol. ii. p. 441.

wretched and how oppressive had been the ancient government, with its own abuses, and the abuses of the aristocracy, when men seemed to have no terror but of its return."[1]

The annexation of Avignon and the Venaissin to France was among the last acts of the Constituent Assembly (September 14th, 1791). Avignon and its territory had been a possession of the See of Rome ever since the sale of it to the Pope by Joanna, Queen of Naples and Countess of Provence, in 1348. But the existence of a foreign colony in the heart of France was a source of much inconvenience; it became the refuge of the disaffected and the entrepôt of the smuggler. A party in Avignon, favourable to the Revolution, had risen in June, 1790, and solicited its union with France; formidable riots had occurred, much blood had been spilt, and many atrocities committed. The Assembly, says Toulongeon, after discussing the diplomatic titles and treaties which assured the sovereignty to the Popes, was naturally led by its principles to the *original title*, which gives a people, when its will is unequivocally pronounced, a right to change its government.[2] The people of Avignon do not, however, appear to have been altogether so unanimous. Within a month after the annexation the Papal party rose, but were put down by the horrible massacres in the tower called *La Glacière*—a foretaste of the horrors which ensued in France.

The Act of the Constitution having been proclaimed with great pomp, September 18th, the Assembly declared its labours terminated and the Revolution accomplished. Such was their security, such their foresight! The Chamber was closed, September 30th. As the members were departing, the populace crowned Robespierre and Pétion with garlands of oak-leaves, and carried them home in triumph. Robespierre was now very popular, and had latterly enjoyed a large share of influence in the Assembly. It was on his motion that they had passed a sort of self-denying ordinance by which they had declared themselves ineligible to the Assembly that was to succeed them. He had also procured a decree, only a few days after the death of Mirabeau, that no member of the Assembly should become a Minister within four years after the conclusion of the session.[3] Both these measures were carried by acclamation. The royalists and aristocrats hoped that an entirely new Assembly might undo all that had been done;

[1] Smyth, *Lectures on the French Revolution*, vol. ii. p. 10.

[2] *Hist. de France*, t. i. p. 243.

[3] See *Hist. Parl.* t. ix. p. 318, t. x. p. 25.

while some were moved by that false generosity which led the public men of France to abandon what seemed for their own private advantage without considering whether it was not also for the public good; some by pique and personal resentment, the despair of seeing themselves again returned, and the desire to reduce others to their own level; a few from deeper and more designing motives. By their assent to these acts, Barnave, Duport, the Lameths, and the whole Constitutional party, pronounced their own political annihilation; and such was, doubtless, Robespierre's design. It is true that by the same act he excluded himself; but he knew full well that the real power of the State lay not so much in the National Assembly, as in the Paris mob and the Jacobins who directed it, among whom he was a ruling power. Louis accepted the Constitution, and sent a notification to that effect to the foreign Powers.[1]

After the acceptance of the Constitution, the great mass of the middle classes were content with what had been done. They were weary of the long struggles and disturbances, were desirous only of returning peaceably to their ordinary pursuits, and had fallen into a sort of political apathy. In Paris not a quarter of the enfranchised citizens came forward to vote for members of the new Assembly. This Chamber, which opened its sittings October 1st, 1791, assumed the title of the NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY. It was far from being composed of such distinguished men as had sat in the Constituent. France had exhausted her best talent, and, by Robespierre's self-denying ordinance, had also deprived herself of the services of men who had acquired some political experience. The new deputies were mostly young men of the middle class. The aristocrats sneeringly observed that they could not muster among them 300,000 livres of income from landed and other property. The Right of the Legislative Assembly was composed of the *Feuillant* party, whose principles were represented by the club already mentioned. The Centre consisted of moderate men attached to the new Constitution. The Left was chiefly formed by the party called GIRONDISTS, so named from the twelve deputies of the Gironde, for the most part lawyers and men of talent, natives of Bordeaux and the southern provinces. The three most distinguished and eloquent members of this deputation were Vergniaud, Guadet, and Gensonné. The Girondists, however, were also joined by deputies from other

[1] Garden, *Traités*, t. v. p. 169 sq.; *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 163.

parts, as Brissot, Condorcet, Rabaud St. Etienne, Pétion, and others; and as Brissot was one of their principal leaders, the party is also sometimes called Brissotins. On the left sat also a still more democratic faction, led by such men as Chabot, Bazire, and Merlin. At the first sitting of the new Assembly, the Book of the Constitution was solemnly presented to it by the Archivist and twelve of the oldest members of the Constituent Assembly; when the deputies took an oath to observe it and to live as freemen or to die.

The Constitutional party, however, were now fast declining. Besides the loss of their parliamentary influence, they were also deprived of municipal power and the command of the armed force. The functions of Lafayette as commandant of the National Guard had been suppressed by a decree of September 12th; and Bailly, alarmed at his retirement, resigned the mayoralty. Lafayette aspired to succeed him, but found a competitor in Pétion. Lafayette's reputation with the people was of that equivocal sort which, in a momentous crisis, must always attach to a man who takes no very decided part; while Pétion was at this period the idol of the people, and was also supported by the Court, which hated Lafayette, and had taken a just view of Pétion's calibre and incapacity.[1] The election of Pétion by a large majority was a triumph for the Gironde. Soon afterwards, Manuel was appointed *Procureur de la Commune*, with Danton as substitute. A change of ministry also took place in October. Montmorin resigned the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, and was succeeded by De Lessart; Bertrand de Moleville became Minister of Marine, and Count de Narbonne, the friend, some say something more, of Madame de Staël, succeeded Duportail as Minister of War. This Cabinet is thought to have been a good deal inspired by Madame de Staël.

Among the more important questions that first engaged the attention of the Legislative Assembly, was that of the emigration. The number of emigrants was increasing every day; 1,900 officers had quitted the army, and crossed the frontiers.[2] Monsieur, by his flight, drew many nobles after him, who should have remained in France, and rallied round the throne. He now took the lead of the emigration instead of his brother, the Count d'Artois; a kind of little Court gathered round him at Coblenz, which place became the head-quarters of the emigration. The Emperor Leopold discountenanced them. He even punished some Brabanters who had

[1] Bertrand de Moleville, *Mémoires*. [2] Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 95.

insulted the French national cockade, and he forbade all assemblies of the emigrants within his dominions, even without arms.[1] The King of Prussia followed his example. The Elector of Trèves alone openly favoured the emigrants. The Assembly voted a Proclamation, October 31st, requiring the King's eldest brother, Louis Stanislas Xavier, to return to France within two months; or, in default, to forfeit his eventual title to the Regency. On the 9th of November they declared all emigrants whatsoever suspected of conspiracy, and liable to the punishment of death, with confiscation of their properties, if they remained assembled together after January 1st, 1792.[2] The King wrote to his brothers ordering them to return; but they made a flippant answer. Louis sanctioned the decree against his brother, but put his *veto* on that of November 9th. This was a sort of victory for the Gironde, who took advantage of it to describe the *veto* as a conspiracy between the King and the emigrants, backed by the foreign Powers.

Louis XVI. wrote to the Elector of Trèves and other German Princes, December 20th, declaring that he should regard them as enemies if they encouraged the assembling of emigrants; while the Emperor, on his side, announced that he had instructed General Bender to assist the Elector, if his territories should be invaded; on condition, however, that he had fulfilled his engagement to disperse the emigrants.[3] The Girondists, and especially Brissot, Gensonné, and Isnard, were at this time using every endeavour to bring about a war by their inflammatory speeches. They regarded it as a means of establishing the Revolution at home, and spreading revolutionary principles abroad. Narbonne and Lafayette were also for war; but Robespierre and the Jacobins opposed it. Not that they did not approve the contemplated ends, but they were jealous of Narbonne and Lafayette, and they feared that a powerful general might make himself a Dictator. But it was resolved to raise three armies consisting of 150,000 men in all, to be commanded respectively by General Rochambeau, Luckner, and Lafayette. On January 1st, 1792, the Assembly decreed the accusation of Monsieur, the Count d'Artois, the Prince of Condé, Calonne, and a few others,[4] and by a resolution of January 25th, they invited the King to demand of the Emperor his intentions, and to call upon him to renounce all treaties and conventions directed against the sovereignty, independence, and

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 167; Von Sybel, i. 358 (Eng. tr.).
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xii. p. 218 sqq.
[3] *Souvenirs* de M. Dumas, t. ii. p. 47, ap. Blanc, t. v. p. 253.
[4] *Hist. Parl.* t. xiii. p. 13.

security of the French nation. His refraining to answer before March 1st, was to be considered equivalent to a declaration of war. The news of this proceeding excited the Emperor's anger. He now converted the preliminary treaty with Prussia of July 25th, 1791, into a definitive alliance by the Treaty of Berlin, February 7th, 1792;[1] he gave orders for the formation of a *corps d'armée* in Bohemia, and marched 6,000 men into the Breisgau. The orders given to Bender were justified; complaints were made of the captivity in which the French King, the Emperor's brother-in-law, was held, and of the anarchy in France; and all these misfortunes were imputed to the pernicious sect of the Jacobins.[2] This reply was received by the Assembly with insult and derision. The somewhat sudden death of Leopold II. (February 29th), arrested for a while the proceedings of the Coalition; which was also weakened by the assassination of Gustavus III. of Sweden, a fortnight afterwards: an event hailed with joy by the Girondists and Jacobins. The brother of Gustavus, Regent during the minority of his nephew, Gustavus IV., determined to observe the strictest neutrality; and Spain seemed to incline the same way, after the Count d'Aranda became Prime Minister.[3] The correspondence with the Emperor led to a change of Ministry in France. De Lessart, the Foreign Minister, was impeached for having concealed the real state of affairs; Narbonne had already been dismissed; and the Girondists achieved a triumph by forcing on the Court a Ministry selected from their own party. These men had already begun to display the violence of their principles. Vergniaud, in accusing the Minister, had not obscurely threatened some of the Royal family with death; and his words had been greeted with thunders of applause.[4] The Gironde now imposed Dumouriez on the King as Foreign Minister; Roland was made Minister of the Interior; De Graves, of War; Lacoste was appointed to the Marine in place of Bertrand de Moleville; Clavière to the Finances, Duranton to the Department of Justice.

The most remarkable of the new Ministers were Dumouriez and Roland, the latter, however, chiefly through his extraordinary wife. Roland himself is a good specimen of the talking, scribbling,

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 5, and the *Suppl.* t. ii. p. 172.

[2] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 232 sqq. According to Madame de Staël, *Considérations*, &c. partie iii. ch. 5, this note was drawn up by Barnave and Duport, the secret counsellors of the Queen, and by her transmitted to Leopold.

[3] Garden, *Traités*, t. v. pp. 180 and 219.

[4] "Que tous ceux qui habitent le palais sachent que le roi seul est inviolable, que la loi y atteindra sans distinction tous les coupables, et qu'il n'y a pas une tête qui convaincue d'être criminelle, puisse échapper à son glaive."—*Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 397 sqq. Cf. L. Blanc, t. vi. p. 296.

philosophical, and factious Girondists. He had dissipated in his youth the greater part of his patrimony, and at the mature age of fifty-eight he married Marion, or Marie Jeanne Phlipon, the daughter of an engraver on the Quai des Lunettes. Handsome, clever, inquisitive, self-educated, Marion had devoured, but without judgment or selection, a vast quantity of books; had studied by turns Jansenius and Pascal, Descartes and Malebranche, Voltaire and the Encyclopædists; and had been alternately a Jansenist, a Cartesian, and a Deist. The reading of Plutarch, whose works she took to church instead of the *Semaine Sainte*, had made her at an early period an ardent Republican, and her chief regret was not to have been born a citizen of Athens, Sparta, or Rome. With these unfeminine studies and aspirations, she possessed an inhuman and bloodthirsty mind.[1] She had so far outstripped the leaders of the Revolution, that in a letter, written soon after the taking of the Bastille, she urged, in obscene language, either the trial and execution of the King and Queen, or their assassination. But she had great talent and a ready pen; she shared the official labours of her husband, wrote many of his papers, and became the very soul of the Gironde.

The Girondists were thus masters of the Government, but unfortunately not of the Jacobins. In fact their advancement to the Ministry produced an open breach between them and Robespierre, the Jacobin leader, who was jealous at seeing all place and power in their hands. The Girondists on their side dreaded Robespierre's influence with the people; and, on April 25th, 1792, Brissot and Guadet, two leading members of the Assembly, denounced him to the Jacobin Club as an agitator. But Robespierre made a triumphant defence in a speech which was much applauded, and is also remarkable as giving the first indication of his system of blood and terror. He conjured the Brissotins to unite with him against the common enemy, and to cause the sword of the executioner to move horizontally, so as to strike off the heads of all the conspirators against liberty.[2]

Francis, who at the age of twenty-two succeeded to the Austrian hereditary dominions on the death of Leopold II., adopted his father's policy with regard to France; though, not having been yet elected Emperor, he was under no obligation to support the cause of the German Princes. One of the first acts of his reign was to assure the King of Prussia of his adherence to the principles

[1] Croker, *Essays on Fr. Revol.* p. 175 sq.
[2] *Mém. de Wéber*, ch. v. p. 322; Croker, *Essays*, p. 335 sqq.

of the recent alliance. Frederick William was inclined to co-operate in the deliverance of Louis XVI. and his restoration to his former power; but this feeling was not shared by his Cabinet, nor by the Duke of Brunswick, one of his principal advisers. Indeed, the sympathy of the King himself did not go the length of any great self-devotion; and he told the Austrian Cabinet that, though he was not unwilling, under certain circumstances, that an armed intervention should be threatened, yet, should war unhappily arise, he must insist upon a just compensation for any losses and dangers,[1] by which he meant a share in the contemplated partition of Poland. The views of Prussian statesmen were now directed towards a second partition of that country, and if they were inclined to assist the King of France, it was only in compliance with the wishes of the Czarina, who had made it a condition of admitting Prussia to a share of the Polish spoils. Catharine II. had exhibited a violent animosity against the French Revolution, which was, perhaps, partly sincere, but which was also suspected of originating in a desire to facilitate her views upon Poland, by despatching to a distance the armies of Austria and Prussia. In some negotiations with M. de Noailles, the French Ambassador at Vienna, Prince Kaunitz laid down as points from which Austria could not depart: 1st, the satisfaction of the German Princes for their possessions in Alsace and Lorraine; 2nd, the satisfaction of the Pope for the County of Avignon; 3rd, France to take such domestic measures as she might think proper, but which should be such that the Government should be sufficiently strong to repress everything calculated to disturb other States.[2] These demands were ill-received. The Girondists, especially Brissot and Dumouriez, were for an immediate appeal to arms, and compelled the King to proceed to the Assembly, April 20th, and to declare war against his nephew, Francis I., King of Hungary and Bohemia, which he did with a trembling voice and evident reluctance. But the announcement was hailed with enthusiasm by the French nation.

At this time the French army of the North, numbering about 50,000 men, under Marshal Rochambeau, was cantoned between Dunkirk and Philippeville. The army of the Centre, under Lafayette, which was rather stronger, stretched from Philippeville to Weissenburg; while that of the Rhine, about 40,000 men, under Luckner, was posted between Weissenburg and Basle.

[1] Letter ap. Von Sybel, ii. 7.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xiv. p. 26; *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 322.

The frontier of the Alps and the Pyrenees was confided to the care of General Montesquiou; but this quarter was not yet threatened. Dumouriez, who had sent secret agents into Belgium to excite the Brabanters to revolt, determined on taking the offensive; and he ordered columns of attack from the armies of Rochambeau and Lafayette to be rapidly directed on different parts of Belgium, in the hope that the inhabitants would rise and aid the invasion. But in this he was disappointed. The leading columns, which were too weak, advanced as far as Lille and Valenciennes; but although there was only a small Austrian force at present in the Low Countries, the French fled in panic at the first sight of the enemy, April 28th; and Lafayette, who had advanced to Bouvines, was compelled by their flight also to retire. The retreating troops fired on their officers, and massacred General Dillon and other of their commanders. Rochambeau was now superseded by Luckner, and the French army stood on the defensive.

This reverse, which was imputed to treachery, excited great distrust and suspicion at Paris, and increased the dissensions between the Feuillants and the Girondists. The Assembly declared itself *en permanence*, and seized the whole management of affairs. The Girondist faction had begun a course of policy which was highly distasteful, not only to the King, but also to Dumouriez. They denounced, through the journalist Carra, what they called an *Austrian Committee*, or a conspiracy of the Court with the Coalition, an accusation aimed chiefly at the Queen. They carried a decree forbidding ecclesiastics to appear in public in their costume. They obtained the dismissal of the King's guard of 12,000 men, and sent their commander, the Duke de Brissac, a prisoner to Orleans. They procured a decree for the transportation of priests who refused to take the civic oath. Servan, the new Minister of War, without saying a word to his colleagues in the Council, suddenly proposed to the Assembly to form a federal army of 20,000 men, selected from all the departments of France, to be encamped on the north side of Paris; and the Assembly decreed the measure, June 8th.[1]

The King could not help showing his aversion to these measures, and he refused to sanction the decrees for the banishment of the priests and the establishment of a federal army. Roland now addressed to him his famous letter, written by his wife, ex-

[1] *Séance* du 4 Juin, 1792, *Hist. Parl.* t. xiv. p. 419.

horting Louis to put himself at the head of the Revolution.[1] But it only confirmed the King in his intention to break with the Gironde; and on June 13th, Servan, Roland, and Clavière were dismissed. A few days afterwards, Dumouriez also resigned, being offended at the coldness and disdain with which the King treated him. Of the Girondist Ministry only Lacoste and Duranthon were retained; and the places of the others were supplied by persons of no note, selected from the Feuillant party.

Lafayette, at this crisis, by an ill-judged attempt to support the Constitutional Monarchy, addressed a dictatorial letter to the Legislative Assembly from his camp at Maubeuge (June 16th), in which he denounced the Jacobin faction, demanded the suppression of the clubs, and exhorted the Assembly to rally round a Constitutional throne.[2] This imprudent step gave the finishing blow to Lafayette's reputation as a patriot, and helped to prepare the insurrection of June 20th and August 10th. None had hitherto been admitted into the National Guard except those who could provide their own uniform and equipments, a regulation which had kept the force in some degree select; but now it was ordered that pikes should take rank with bayonets, and that all who presented themselves should be admitted to serve. The sixty battalions were also reduced to forty-eight, the number of the new sections; which served to create a fresh mixture of the men, and still further to destroy Lafayette's influence over them.[3]

It must be borne in mind that, besides the quarrel of the Gironde with the King, a struggle for power was now going on between Robespierre and the Girondists. The measures of that party just described, the persecution of the priests, the raising of a federal army, even the declaration of war against Austria, were bids for mob popularity; and they were now contriving how they might regain power by means of an insurrection. Robespierre, irritated at seeing his functions taken out of his hands, denounced the Girondists as "hypocrites of liberty;" inveighed, in the Jacobin Club, June 13th, against any partial insurrections, as calculated only to weaken the popular cause; sent Chabot and others into the Faubourg St. Antoine to persuade the inhabitants to confine themselves to a simple petition in favour of the decrees of May 24th and June 8th; exhorted them to await the expected arrival of the Marseillese, and not to rise till the decisive moment

[1] It will be found in the *Mémoires* de Madame Roland, t. i. App. C.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xv. p. 69 sqq.
[3] Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 160 sq.

had come for overturning the throne.[1] He thus affected moderation in order to annoy his adversaries. He even started a journal called *Le défenseur de la Constitution*, which he made a vehicle for attacking the Girondists,[2] and in which he vehemently denounced their contemplated insurrection.

Most historians have considered the insurrection of June 20th, 1792, the anniversary of the oath at the Tennis-Court, as the immediate response of the people to the King's refusal to sanction the two decrees, and the dismissal of the Girondist Ministers; but it had, in fact, been prepared some time before.[3] The "recall of the good Ministers" was, however, made its watchword. Danton seems to have been the chief mover in it; Pétion, divided between hope and fear, only gave it his connivance.[4] The rumours of it had filled the Royal family with alarm, and the King had deposited copies of his will with three notaries. On the whole, however, it was a more peaceable and good-humoured mob than might have been expected. The petitioners, as they called themselves, consisted of some 8,000 men armed with pikes and other weapons, and were accompanied by a large crowd of unarmed persons. One fellow, indeed, carried on a pike a calf's heart, with the inscription, "heart of an aristocrat," and there were other menacing emblems, but intermixed with peaceable ones, such as ears of corn, green boughs, and nosegays. Led by Santerre and St. Huruge, they were permitted to defile through the Chamber of the Assembly, singing *Ca ira*, dancing and shouting *Vive la nation! Vivent les sans-culottes! A bas le veto!*

From the Assembly the mob proceeded to the Tuileries. The King displayed great firmness during this terrible visit. He ordered the doors to be thrown open, advanced to meet the crowd, asked them what they wanted, observed that he had not violated the Constitution. He then retired into the embrasure of a window, surrounded by a few faithful attendants. When the people urged him to sanction the two decrees, he replied, "This is not the time nor the place." To their demands that he should recall his Ministers, he merely answered, "I shall do what the

[1] *Deposition of Chabot* before Revol. Tribunal, *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 40.

[2] See Croker, *Essays, &c.* p. 182 sqq. The first number of the *Défenseur* appeared in May, 1792; the twelfth and last, August 10th. "Every line of it shows," says Mr. Croker, "that in the self-denying ordinance nothing was further from Robespierre's intention than any self-sacrifice." (*Ibid.* p. 339.) After Robespierre's election to the Convention, he continued this Journal under the title of *Lettres à ses Constituants.*

[3] Mortimer Terneau, *Hist. de la Terreur*, t. i. p. 129.

[4] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 465 sq.

Constitution directs." He put on a *bonnet-rouge* thrust towards him on a pike; but with the exception of a brutal and insulting speech from the butcher Legendre, afterwards a notorious member of the Convention, and the attack of a ruffian, who menaced him with a pike, but was hindered from doing any mischief, no further violence occurred. After this scene had lasted two hours, Pétion, the mayor, arrived, and, with the assistance of the deputies, Vergniaud and Isnard, persuaded the mob to depart. The King's sister, the Princess Elizabeth, had stood by his side the whole time. A scene somewhat similar passed in the Queen's apartments. Here Santerre, the brewer, took upon himself the office of master of the ceremonies, and as the crowd defiled through the room, pointed out to them Marie Antoinette and her son, observing, "This is the Queen, this is the Prince Royal!" Both the Queen and her son put on the *bonnet-rouge*. Napoleon Bonaparte, then a young officer, who was a spectator of this scene from the gardens of the Tuileries, exclaimed, "The wretches! 400 or 500 should be shot, and the rest would soon take to flight!"[1]

Thus the insurrection of June 20th proved a failure, and had even the effect of giving the King a little brief popularity. But Lafayette, by another ill-judged, though well-meant, step, contrived to make matters worse. On June 28th, leaving his army at Maubeuge, he suddenly appeared in the Assembly, and demanded the punishment of the rioters and the suppression of the Jacobin Club. Failing in this quarter, he sought to effect his objects by means of the National Guard, and attempted a review of them in the Champ de Mars, which was forbidden by Pétion. A deputation from some of their battalions had called upon him to lead them against the Jacobins; but Lafayette hesitated, and the opportunity was irrevocably lost. He now proposed to aid the King's flight to Compiègne, and place him at the head of the army; should that fail, that Luckner and himself should march on Paris with their forces. But Marie Antoinette opposed these projects, observing that, if Lafayette was to be their only resource, they had better perish.[2] The Queen also possibly knew, what the result showed, that the army would not have followed Lafayette. His ill-judged protection only served to rally all parties more violently against the Throne. He was attacked in

[1] Bourienne, *Mémoires*, t. i. ch. iv.

[2] Lally Tollendal's *Letter to the King*, *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 243 sqq.; Madame Campan, *Memoirs*, vol. ii. ch. ix. (Engl. Transl.)

the journals, denounced in the Assembly, burnt in effigy by the Jacobins, and compelled to quit Paris. The Feuillant Club was now closed; the grenadier companies and chasseurs of the National Guard, who had displayed some loyalty, were cashiered; the soldiers of the line were removed from the capital.

The refusal of Lafayette's aid sprang, no doubt, in a great degree from hatred of him, as one of the earliest promoters of the Revolution. But a proposal of the Duke de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, Commandant of Rouen, whose troops were devoted to him, that the King should fly to that city, was also refused; and hence we are led to the conclusion that the Court, at this juncture, relied on the invasion of the allied Powers for their deliverance in preference to venturing on a civil war. The failure of the French troops, in their first encounters with the enemy, was calculated to nourish this hope. This view is confirmed by the fact that the King had now entered into secret negotiations with the Coalition, and by the advice of M. Malouet had sent Mallet du Pan to treat with the allied Sovereigns. A Memoir was drawn up for this purpose from the King's instructions by Mallet du Pan, and corrected with Louis's own hand.[1] The very first sentence of this document expresses that a counter-revolution was contemplated; a project for which the insurrection of June 20th, to which it alludes, can alone afford the King some justification. The paper sets out with a description of parties in France. The Girondists, as well as the other section of the Jacobins, are denounced as virtually Republicans, though the Girondists would leave a sort of nominal Monarchy. The other two parties, the *Feuillants*, or Constitutionalists, and the *Indépendants*, or Neutrals, are spoken of with contempt. The King congratulates himself on the foreign war, as destined to effect all that could have been hoped from a civil war, with less peril, misfortune, and uncertainty.[2] The main object of the Memoir is to inform the allied Sovereigns of the manner in which the King wished the counter-revolution to be effected. It is strongly impressed upon them that the war should have as much as possible the appearance of a *foreign* war, and that the emigrants should not take any active and offensive part in it. Mallet du Pan had an interview

[1] It will be found in *Mém et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. i.; *Pièces Justif.* p. 427 sqq. It was first published by Professor Smyth, in his *Lectures on the Fr. Revol.* t. ii. p. 245 sqq.

[2] "Mais la guerre extérieure, dont la Providence a inspiré la déclaration aux factieux, est destinée à faire maintenant avec moins de périls, de malheurs, et d'incertitude, ce qu'on pourrait espérer de la guerre civile."—*Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan, &c.* t. i. p. 440.

at Frankfort, in July, with the Ministers of the Courts of Vienna and Berlin, who were in the suite of the King of Hungary and Bohemia. That Sovereign, as we have already said, was elected Emperor, July 5th, with the title of Francis II.; and on the 11th he had entered Frankfort in state, accompanied by the Empress, the Archduke Joseph, and a brilliant Court, for the ceremony of his coronation.

After the insurrection, and the attempt of Lafayette, the leaders of the Gironde began to declaim violently against the King. All Paris seemed moved with a patriotic phrenzy. Lamourette having exhorted the Assembly to have but one soul, the members of the Right and Left rushed into one another's arms and hugged each other in a fraternal embrace: next day they were greater enemies than ever. On the motion of Hérault de Sechelles a decree was passed, July 11th, that "the country is in danger."[1] The day before all the Ministers had resigned, an act which produced no impression. Their places were filled up by unimportant persons.

As the King had put his *veto* on the decree summoning the federal volunteers to Paris, another had been passed appointing Soissons as the place of the federal camp; and to this he gave his sanction. The troops were first to visit the capital, to participate in the anniversary fête of the Federation which was now approaching. The Jacobins of Brest and Marseilles were most active in forwarding these men. Marseilles especially, besides isolated bands, sent three regular battalions, in February, July, and October, 1792, the first of which was led by Barbaroux. A great many of these men remained in Paris, at the instance of Danton. Though called Marseillese, they were, for the most part, the scum of the prisons of Italy and the Mediterranean coasts.[2] They sang the well-known hymn, composed at Strasburg by Rouget de l'Isle, an officer of engineers, but first published at Marseilles, and thence called the *Marseillaise*.[3]

On July 14th, the fête of the Federation, the Champ de Mars was covered with eighty-three tents, one for each department. In the centre rose a symbolical tomb for those who should die on the frontiers, with the inscription: "*Tremblez, tyrans, nous les*

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xv. p. 358 sq.

[2] Blanc Gilli, *Réveil d'alarme*, ap. Barbaroux, p. 40; Terneau, t. ii. p. 142.

[3] See Lautard, *Marseilles depuis* 1789 *jusqu'en* 1815, t. i. p. 133, ap. Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 221. Cf. *Chronique de Paris*, in *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 205. "Les Marseillais," says this Chronicle, "le chantent avec beaucoup d'ensemble; et le moment où agitant leurs chapeaux et leurs sabres ils crient tous à la fois, *Aux armes citoyens!* fait vraiment frisonner."

vengerons." Behind the altar of the country was a tree, called the "tree of feudality," from the branches of which hung bucklers, casques, escutcheons, crowns, tiaras, cardinals' hats, ermined mantles, &c. After taking the oath to the Constitution at the altar, the King was invited to set fire to this tree, but excused himself on the ground that feudalism no longer existed.[1] This was the last time that he appeared in public. Pétion, who had been suspended from his office of Mayor, for his conduct on June 20th, by the superior authority of the Directory of the Department of Paris,[2] was now reinstated in his functions.

Amid these somewhat melodramatic displays the French showed no lack of patriotism and constancy in the imminent danger with which they were threatened. Hatred of the foreigner and dread of an invasion united men of all shades of opinion. The armies of the Coalition were now collecting on the frontiers of France, under the command-in-chief of the Duke of Brunswick, a Prince of mature years, the companion in arms of Frederick the Great, and enjoying a high reputation both for military and other talent. The Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, William IX., through whose dominions the march of the Prussians lay, and whose geographical position was incompatible with neutrality in a war between Prussia and France, had joined the Coalition in the hope of gaining the Electoral Hat. The Electors of Trèves and Mentz had done the same. The Circles of Suabia had also consented to furnish their contingents as States of the Empire. The Electors of Hanover and Saxony had declared themselves neutral. The Elector of Bavaria also contrived to maintain his neutrality till the spring of 1793; when, at the urgent remonstrance of the Imperial Court, he found himself compelled to add his contingent of 8,000 men to the combined army.[3] The Austrian and Prussian Cabinets had invoked the aid of the Danish Court, in a joint note, dated May 12th, 1792, in which the principal motives alleged for interfering in the affairs of France were her revolutionary propagandism and the violence exercised towards the King. But the Danish Minister, Count Bernstorff, declined to interfere, on the ground that Denmark, like other States, had recognized the new French Constitution, and that no direct and public step had as yet been taken to overthrow it. The King of Denmark, it was added, had already preserved his subjects from the dangers of

[1] Weber, *Mém.* ch. v. p. 212.

[2] The Department of Paris comprised the forty-eight sections and sixteen rural districts.

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 273.

infection, by a measure adapted to the genius of the nation; a reply which must have sounded very like a reproof to the allied Governments.[1]

The Duke of Brunswick arrived at Coblenz, July 3rd, in the environs of which place the troops under his command were assembling. The emigrant Princes now retired to Bingen. The Emperor and the King of Prussia had a conference at Mentz, July 19th and two following days. The allied Sovereigns exhibited a bitter jealousy of each other, and a selfish anxiety as to what territories they should get by way of compensation. The Emperor's army in the Netherlands was commanded by the Duke of Saxe Teschen. From this 15,000 men were to be detached to cover the right of the Prussian advance and join them near Longwy; while another Austrian army of 20,000 men under Prince Hohenlohe, was to be directed between the Rhine and Moselle to cover the Prussian left, menace Landau, and lay siege to Thionville. A third Austrian *corps d'armée*, under Prince Esterhazy, assembled in the Breisgau, and with 5,000 emigrants under the Prince of Condé, menaced the French frontiers from Switzerland to Phillipsbourg. The French armies were inferior in number to those of the allies; that of Lafayette could hardly be relied on, and, to add to the danger, symptoms of insurrection had manifested themselves in La Vendée and other provinces. Yet when the decree that the country was in danger was proclaimed, July 22nd, in the principal places of Paris, amid the roll of drums and the booming of cannon, thousands rushed to enrol themselves as volunteers in the tents and booths erected for that purpose.

Amidst these hostile preparations the fate of both the King and Monarchy was drawing to a crisis. The federal troops, instead of proceeding to Soissons after the fête, had remained at Paris; and on July 17th they sent a deputation to read to the Assembly an address drawn up by Robespierre, in which the suspension of the King's executive power, the impeachment of Lafayette, the discharge of military commanders nominated by the King, the dismissal and punishment of the departmental directors, &c., were imperiously demanded.[2] Meanwhile the Girondists, threatened on one side by the Court and Lafayette, and on the other by the more violent Jacobins, were endeavouring to work on the King's fears, and reduce him to the dilemma either of throwing himself into their hands, or being crushed by

[1] Garden, *Traités*, t. v. p. 207 sqq. [2] Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. vi. p. 486.

Robespierre and the Republican party. Vergniaud, Guadet, and Gensonné found means to send a letter to Louis XVI. through his *valet de chambre*, Thierry, in which they told him that a terrible insurrection was preparing; that his abdication, or something still more dreadful, would be the result, and recommended, but without effect, as a means to avert the catastrophe, that Roland, Servan, and Clavière should be immediately reinstated in the Ministry. A threatening address to the King, got up in the secret conclaves of the Gironde, was also read in the Assembly, July 26th. It concluded thus: "You can still, Sire, save the country, and with it your Crown; dare then to will it. Let the name of your Ministers, let the sight of the men who surround you, appeal to the public confidence." But the address was greeted with tumultuous disapprobation by the people in the tribunes.[1]

Measures had now been taken to organize an insurrection. A central bureau of correspondence among the forty-eight sections had been established at the Hôtel de Ville, July 17th, at which commissaries from the various sections appeared every day; and thus a rapid communication was established among them all. These commissaries ultimately formed, on the day of the insurrection, the revolutionary *Commune*, which ejected the legitimate General Council of the Municipality.[2] Already some affairs had occurred which foreshadowed the coming event. The Marseillese had got up a quarrel with some grenadiers of the National Guard, in which blood had been spilt. This affair increased the agitation among the respectable classes, and filled every bosom with hatred or fear. The National Guards of the more aristocratic quarters of Paris were burning to put an end to the Revolution, and a band of courageous gentlemen had offered their services in defence of the Palace.

The 20th of June had been the day of the *Gironde;* the 10th of August, for which, after some postponements, the second insurrection was ultimately fixed, was to achieve the triumph of the *Montagne*, or ultra-democrats. Most of the leading Girondists, Brissot, Vergniaud, Condorcet, Isnard, Lasource, and others, opposed the movement; Brissot and Isnard even talked of sending Robespierre before the Court at Orleans, which would have been equivalent to bringing him to the scaffold;[3] Pétion and Rœderer,

[1] Rœderer, *Chronique de 50 jours*, ap. Croker, *Essays on the French Revol.* p. 212; L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.* t. vii. p. 4.

[2] M. Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 138.

[3] L. Blanc, t. vii. p. 20.

though with fear and doubt, ultimately lent their aid to the insurrection. But the men who had incited it, and were to reap its fruits, kept themselves in the background. Neither Robespierre nor Danton, though each after his manner was urging on the movement, took part in the secret insurrectional committee at the Jacobins, which consisted for the most part of obscure persons. Danton, whose character, if more corrupt,[1] was at least more open than Robespierre's, made no secret of his hopes of profit and advantage from the event. The views of the sly and egotistical Robespierre were more designing and ambitious. He sounded Barbaroux on the subject of procuring for him a dictatorship by means of the Marseillese; but Barbaroux flatly refused.[2] Marat was afraid to abide the outbreak which his atrocious writings had so much contributed to produce; and feeling himself insecure in his cellar, he besought Barbaroux to conduct him to Marseilles in the disguise of a jockey.[3]

While Paris was thus on the eve of an insurrection, the bitter feeling which prevailed against the Court was increased tenfold by a highly injudicious manifesto, published by the Duke of Brunswick, July 25th, on breaking up from Coblenz to invade the French frontier. In this paper it was declared: That the object of the Coalition was to put an end to anarchy in France, and to restore Louis XVI. to his legitimate authority; that if the King was not immediately restored to perfect liberty, or if the respect and inviolability due to him and the Royal family were infringed, the Assembly, the Department, the Municipality, and other public bodies would be made responsible with their heads; that if the Palace was insulted or forced, and any violence offered to the King or his family, Paris would be abandoned to military execution and total destruction. But—what was felt as more insulting than all this—if the Parisians promptly obeyed these orders, then the allied Princes engaged to obtain from Louis XVI. a pardon for their faults and errors. By a second declaration, dated July 27th, the Duke threatened that if the King or any member of the Royal family should be carried off from Paris, the road through which they had

[1] He had already touched 30,000 livres, the money of the Court. See *Corr. entre Mirabeau et le Comte de la Marck*, t. iii. p. 82; *Mémoires de Lafayette*, ap. L. Blanc, t. v. p. 378, t. vii. p. 27 and 96.

[2] *Mémoires* de Barbaroux, ch. v. p. 62 sqq. We see no reason for doubting this statement, with M. L. Blanc (t. vii. p. 30), merely because it agrees not with Robespierre's public speeches. Barbaroux charged Robespierre with the design to his face in the Convention, September 25th, 1792. Robespierre was silent; and though his creature Panis denied the charge, it was supported by Rebecqui. See *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 88 sqq.

[3] Barbaroux, *ibid.*

been conducted should be marked by a continued series of exemplary punishments.[1]

The tone of this manifest was not at all in accordance with the suggestion of Mallet du Pan. It had been drawn up by the Marquis de Limon, according to the views of Calonne, and had obtained the approbation of the allied Sovereigns, though the Duke of Brunswick himself disapproved of it. The passage respecting the destruction of Paris is even said to have been inserted after it had received the Duke's signature.[2] At all events, the manifest should not have been published till the allied armies were nearer to Paris, and, after issuing it, the march of the troops on that capital should have been precipitated. We do not, however, believe that this manifesto caused the overthrow of the French Monarchy; that was already determined on; but by wounding the national pride of the French, it strengthened the impending insurrection, and also roused them to a more vigorous defence against the invasion. A little after Monsieur, the King's brother, and other emigrant Princes, published at Trèves (August 8th), a declaration of their motives and intentions. Their army, of about 12,000 men, was to keep in the rear of the Prussians, and follow their line of operations.[3] The accession of the Court of Turin to the Coalition, July 25th, which offered to furnish 40,000 men,[4] must also have tended to irritate the French.

The Duke of Brunswick's manifesto was officially communicated to the Assembly, August 3rd; when the King thought proper to assure the Chamber in a letter, that he would never compound the glory and interests of the nation, never receive the law at the hands of foreigners or a party; that he would maintain the national independence with his last breath.[5] Such professions were, to say the least, very uncandid, when he was negotiating with the enemies of France. On the same day, Pétion, at the head of a deputation from the *Commune*, appeared at the bar of the Assembly, denounced the *crimes* of Louis XVI., his sanguinary projects against Paris, and demanded his abdication.[6] The petition which he presented to this purport had been approved by all the Sections of Paris except one. The insurrection would have taken place immediately, but Santerre, the leader of the Faubourg St. Antoine, and the devoted servant of Robespierre, was not yet prepared.

[1] The manifest will be found in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xvi. and in L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* ch. viii. App.

[2] *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. i. p. 316 sqq.

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 434 sq.

[4] Garden, *Traités*, t. v. p. 180.

[5] Ap. Smyth, vol. ii. p. 327.

[6] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvi. p. 315 sqq.

The King was informed almost hourly of the state of the preparations for the attack on the Tuileries. The anxiety that reigned in the Palace may be easily conceived. Extensive means of defence were adopted, and the King and Queen were not altogether without hopes that it might be successful. Royalty had not yet lost all its supporters. There was in the Assembly a large, but timid party, the friends of order; and the accusation of Lafayette, proposed by Brissot, had been rejected by a majority of almost two to one. But the members who had voted the rejection were hissed and maltreated on leaving the House. The Palace of the Tuileries was at that time much more defensible than it is at present. The Place du Carrousel was covered with small streets; the court of the Palace was enclosed with a wall instead of a railing, and not open, as at present, but divided by ranges of small buildings. Mandat, whose turn it was to command the National Guard, a man of courage, and who had been an officer in the regular army, was a zealous Constitutionalist, and several battalions of that force were also ardently attached to the Throne. Mandat's arrangements were judicious. Twelve guns were planted round the Palace, others on the Pont Neuf, to prevent the junction of the men of the Faubourg St. Marceau with those of the Faubourg St. Antoine; a force was stationed to observe the Hôtel de Ville, with instructions to let the mob pass from the Faubourg St. Antoine, and then to attack them in the rear. The most effective force, however, was the Swiss Guard, about 950 men.

None of the leading Jacobins took any active part in the execution of the attack. Even Barbaroux and his friends Rebecqui and Pierre Baille excused themselves from leading their compatriots, the Marseillese, on the ground that they were the official representatives of the town of Marseilles.[1] On this eventful day the destinies of France were left in the hands of the Commissaries of the Sections, all of them obscure persons, though a few, as Billaud Varennes, Hébert, Bourdon de l'Oise, and two or three more, afterwards became noted in the annals of the Revolution. These men proceeded to the Hôtel de Ville on the night of August 9th, formed themselves into a new *Commune*, and expelled the existing legitimate Council; retaining of the previous magistrates only Pétion, Manuel, and Danton, and the sixteen Administrators. One of the first acts of the insurrectionary *Commune* was to send for Mandat. On entering the Council Hall he was astonished to

[1] *Mém.* de Barbaroux, p. 66 sq.; Terneau, t. ii. p. 307 note.

find it filled with new faces. Before he could recover from his surprise he was overwhelmed with questions. Why had he doubled the guard at the Palace? Had he not detained the Mayor there? Had he not told Pétion that he should answer with his head for any disturbance? Mandat replied as well as he could. He pleaded an order of the Mayor for the arrangements he had made, which he appears really to have received, though he had it not about him. The President of the *Commune* required him to withdraw half the forces at the Tuileries, but Mandat refused to sign the order. Suddenly is handed in the order he had given to the battalion of the National Guards at the Hôtel de Ville to attack the insurgents in the rear, which excites loud cries of indignation. The insurrectionary *Commune* now decide that Mandat shall be transferred to the prison of the Abbaye, *for his greater security*. The assassins at the command of the Commissaries understand what this means. They drag Mandat from the place where he was temporarily confined and hurry him towards the staircase leading to the Place de Grève; but on the first step he is shot through the head with a pistol bullet. The Commissaries must have heard his groans and the shouts of his assassins; but they interrupted not their deliberations.[1] They now appointed Santerre to be provisional commandant-general of the National Guard.

The *tocsin* had been sounding since midnight from all the steeples of Paris, but at first the affluence of the people was not very great. The inmates of the Palace had passed a sleepless night. The Queen and Madame Elizabeth wandered about the apartments; the King spent a long time with his confessor, and then in vain sought a little repose upon a sofa. At five o'clock in the morning of August 10th he visited the military posts; but his appearance was calculated to excite anything but courage and enthusiasm. He was dressed in a violet suit; his *chapeau de bras* being placed under his arm permitted the disorder of his hair to be seen; which, on one side, had become unpowdered, from lying on the sofa. His eyes were red from weeping and want of sleep, his unconnected phrases betrayed the trouble and agitation of his mind. At six o'clock he held a sort of review. Some of the National Guards received him with cries of *Vive le Roi!* but the cannoniers and the battalion *Croix Rouge* shouted *Vive la Nation!* On crossing the garden to visit the posts at the Pont Tournant, he was saluted by the battalions of pikemen with yells of *à bas le*

[1] Mortimer Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 278.

Véto! à bas le traître! These men took up a position near the Pont Royal, and turned their guns on the Tuileries; others did the like on the Place du Carrousel. Thus the Palace was menaced by those summoned to defend it! Marie Antoinette could not help deploring the want of energy shown by the King, and remarked that the review had done more harm than good.[1] Even contemporary Revolutionists were unanimously of opinion that if the King had displayed any resolution he would have carried with him half the National Guard. Santerre had hesitated to advance till he was threatened with death by a man named Westermann. Danton and Desmoulins were among the insurgents, but Robespierre and Marat were nowhere to be seen.[2] Pétion, who was at the Tuileries on pretence of official duties, seemed ill at ease, and even in danger, among the crowd of royalist gentlemen; but he was summoned away by the new *Commune* and *consigned* to his hotel.[3]

The insurgent columns were now advancing in dense masses. The death of Mandat, the withdrawal of the cannon from the Pont Neuf, had spoilt the whole plan of defence. To Rœderer, *procureur-syndic* of the Department, and a Girondist, who was at the Palace in his official capacity, must be mainly attributed the result of the day. It was he who, with treacherous counsels, and in order to throw the King into the hands of his faction, persuaded him to abandon the Palace and take refuge in the Assembly. As early as four o'clock in the morning, before there was any pressing danger, he had suggested this course, but the Queen opposed it. Rœderer then pretended to superintend the defence and animate the troops; but the word ran from rank to rank, "we cannot fire on our brethren." The cannoniers especially would not listen to him. One of them extinguished his match, drew the charge of his gun, and threw it on the ground.[4] Rœderer now repeated his advice to the King to fly to the Assembly, and after a little hesitation Louis consented, to the great chagrin of the Queen. At seven in the morning he left his Palace, never to return. It was with great difficulty the Royal family made their way into the hall of the Assembly. The King was received tolerably well by the mob; but the Queen

[1] Madame Campan, *Memoirs*, vol. ii. ch. x. (Engl. Transl.).
[2] Von Sybel, i. 527 sq. (Engl. Transl.).
[3] Terneau, t. ii. p. 296.
[4] Several publications of the time charged Rœderer with suggesting this act of disaffection and mutiny, and he left the charge uncontradicted more than thirty years. See Croker, *Essays, &c.* p. 228. It was also Rœderer who persuaded Mandat to go to the Town Hall. He published an account of the period between the 20th of June and 10th of August, called *Chronique de Cinquante Jours.*

experienced gross insults and horrible threats, and was robbed of her purse and watch.

The Royal family, on entering the Assembly, took their seats on the benches appropriated to the Ministers. The King said: "I am come hither to avoid a great crime, and I think, gentlemen, that I can nowhere be safer than among you."— Vergniaud, the president, replied: "Sire, you may rely upon the firmness of the National Assembly; its members have sworn to die in support of the rights of the people and of the constituted authorities." A member having remarked that the Constitution forbade them to debate in the King's presence, the Royal family were conducted to a small room appropriated to the short-hand writers.

The departure of the King spread consternation through the Palace and was fatal to its defence. Who should fight in a self-abandoned cause? Whole battalions of the National Guard either dispersed themselves or joined the men of the faubourgs. The Swiss alone showed admirable fidelity, courage, and discipline, though two, even of these, were induced to fraternize with the insurgents. They were brought down by shots from the gentlemen in the apartments of the Palace. The first report of firearms caused a horrible confusion. Rage or terror filled every breast. The Swiss, ranged on the staircase of the Palace, were ordered to fire, and in a moment scores of those who filled the vestibule were extended on the floor. Then, led by their colonel, Pfyffer, the Swiss made a sortie, cleared the Carrousel with much slaughter, seized three cannons and dragged them to the Palace. But they had routed only the advanced guard of the insurrection. The bands of the faubourgs still came pouring on with horrible shouts for vengeance. At this crisis the defence was abandoned by order of the King, who sent to the Swiss, by M. d'Hervilly, an order to that effect, hastily written in pencil.[1] The greater part of this heroic band were killed in attempting a retreat, some towards the Assembly, some through the gardens of the Tuileries. Bonaparte, then in a state of poverty approaching destitution,[2] who beheld the attack on the Palace from a shop on the Carrousel belonging to the brother of his friend and schoolfellow Bourrienne, observed, when at St. Helena, that after none of his battles had he been so struck with the aspect of death as by the heaps of

[1] Mortimer Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 320 sqq. Most previous historians represent the Palace as forced by the mob.

[2] He had formed with Bourrienne the project of making a living by taking houses and underletting them. Bourrienne, *Mém.* t. i. p. 48.

corpses in the Tuileries garden.[1] The number killed on the side of the assailants appears, however, from recent researches, to have been under 200.[2] After the withdrawal of the guard the Palace was entered by the mob, when every male inmate was murdered and the furniture stolen or destroyed.

[1] *Mém.* de Las Casas, t. v. p. 129.

[2] Terneau, *ibid.* notes, p. 494.

CHAPTER LV.

THE Girondists seemed at first to reap the fruits of a victory achieved by others. The Assembly, in which that party prevailed, assumed at once all the executive power of the State, and, at the instance of Vergniaud, its president, directed the provisional suspension of the King, the nomination of a tutor for the Prince Royal, the installation of the King and Royal family at the Luxembourg, sanctioned the decrees on which the King had placed his *veto*, ordered the accusation of the Minister, Abancourt, for not carrying out a decree against the Swiss Guard, sent commissaries to the armies to suspend the Generals, decreed domiciliary visits to suspected persons.[1] All this was done, August 10th, in the presence of the King. The Assembly, of which only members of the Left were present, also took upon itself to form a new Ministry; restored Roland, Servan, and Clavière to their former places, appointed Lebrun Minister for Foreign Affairs, Monge to the Department of Marine, Danton to that of Justice. Danton, a sort of caricature of Mirabeau, with all his animal sensualism, but without his genius, had been an advocate in the King's Council since 1787, but had little practice. He was remarkable for his high stature, athletic form, stentorian voice, and what he called his audacity, which was rather effrontery. These endowments served to qualify him for a demagogue and bully; but he quailed if boldly met.[2] He had taken little part in the insurrection; but after the victory he appeared at the head of the Marseillese with a great sabre, as if he had been the hero of the day.[3] He appointed Camille Desmoulins and Fabre d'Eglantine his secretaries.

But the reins of power were really held at this juncture by the new *Commune*, or Municipality, supported by the armed mob. It was not till the morning of August 11th that the wary Robespierre had caused himself to be named a member of it for the Section in which he lived, that of the *Piques*, Place Vendôme.[4]

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 18 sq.
[2] Prudhomme, t. ii. p. 326.
[3] Louvet, *Mémoires*, p. 12, ap. Cran. de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 449 sq.
[4] He now lived with Duplay, the joiner, Rue St. Honoré.

But he avoided appearing prominently in it, kept himself in a corner of the Council Chamber, yet directed all the steps of the *Commune;* and while the Legislative Assembly existed, headed several violent deputations to its bar.[1] Marat was also a leading member of the insurrectionary *Commune;* such was their respect for him that they assigned him a private tribune.[2] A Committee of Surveillance was appointed, which assumed all the functions of Government; ordered, among other things, the barriers to be closed, passports to be suspended; non-juring priests to leave France within a fortnight; the ladies of the Queen and several officers of the National Guard to be interrogated; decreed a number of arrests, thus filling the prisons for the ensuing massacres. The National Guard was reformed and increased by vast numbers of mere proletaries; the property in the Royal Palaces and the plate in the churches were seized; the Registers at the Hôtel de Ville began to be dated "First year of the Republic." On August 12th the Assembly surrendered the custody of the King and his family to the *Commune,* and on the following day Pétion conducted them from the Luxembourg to the Temple. Here the King was lodged in a gloomy apartment lighted by a single window, and furnished with a wretched bed and a few chairs. The Royal family were not even provided with necessary clothes. The Countess of Sutherland, lady of the English Ambassador, sent some of her son's for the Dauphin. The Tuileries had been abandoned to be plundered by the mob.

The Legislative Assembly was itself to be dissolved to make room for a National Convention. Robespierre had proposed this step at the Jacobin Club on the evening of August 10th.[3] On the 11th the Assembly decreed its own abdication, and fixed the mode of electing a Convention. The electoral franchise was now extended; the distinction of *active* and *inactive* citizens was suppressed; every Frenchman, aged twenty-five, living by his own labour or income, and not in domestic service, if he had taken the civic oath, was declared an elector.[4] But the double degree of election was retained; that is, primary assemblies to choose electoral assemblies, which last returned the deputies. The former were to meet on Sunday, August 26th; the latter on Sunday, September 2nd.

A mixed commission, composed of members of the Assembly

[1] Mortimer Terneau, t. iii. liv. ix.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 196.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 178.
[4] The Constituent Assembly had decreed that a contribution of three days' labour was a necessary qualification to vote in the primary assemblies. *Hist. Parl.* t. iii.

and of the *Commune*, appointed to search the Tuileries, found some letters and documents, which proved that the King had compromised himself with the counter-Revolution.[1] The *Commune* compelled the Assembly to appoint an extraordinary criminal tribunal. Robespierre refused the presidency of it, and had also resigned, in April, the office of Public Accuser, which he had exercised since the preceding February. On the establishment of the new tribunal, August 18th, the *Commune* directed the *guillotine* to be permanently erected in the Place du Carrousel, but the knife to be removed every night.[2] The first victims of this tribunal were Delaporte, *intendant* of the Civil List, D'Angremont, the Queen's master of languages, one Solomon, convicted of forgery, and the journalist Durozoy. Thus was inaugurated the reign of blood; Robespierre had invoked it in the last number of his *Défenseur*.[3] The dominion of the ochlocracy had commenced, of the men who were to strangle the Revolution by their excesses, and prepare the way for a military despotism. Its advent was signalized by some acts of senseless brutality. By order of the *Commune*, the statues of Henry IV., of Louis XIV., and Louis XV., and other monuments, were overthrown; they also decreed the destruction of all emblems and monuments of feudality and despotism, even in private houses.[4] The title of *Citoyen* was to be substituted for that of *Monsieur;* and in public acts after *l'an IV de la liberté* was to be added, *l'an I de l'égalité.*

But, though Paris seemed unanimous, the Revolution of August 10th was not universally welcomed in France. Symptoms of dissatisfaction were manifested at Metz, Nanci, Rouen, Amiens, Strasbourg, and other places.[5] Lafayette conceived the idea of uniting the Directories of the Departments in a Congress, and opposing them to the National Assembly—in short, of confronting Paris with the provinces. The Municipality of Sédan, where his army was stationed, was ready to second the measure. He also thought of marching to Paris, with some regiments devotedly attached to him, when the National Guards would, in all proba-

[1] *Rapport* de Gohier, *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 82.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 211. This instrument derived its name from Dr. Guillotin, a physician of Paris, and member of the Constituent Assembly, who first proposed it in October, 1789. His suggestion, however, was not attended to, and it was not till March, 1792, that, by the advice of M. Louis, secretary to the College of Surgeons, it was first adopted by the Legislative Assembly. The first guillotine was designed and manufactured by one Schmidt, a pianoforte maker, of Strasbourg. See Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 182; Croker, *Essay* viii.

[3] Croker, *Essays*, p. 343.

[4] Duval, *Souvenirs de la Terreur*, t. ii. p. 176 sq.; *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 119. It was a singular coincidence that the statue of Louis XIV., erected August 12th, 1692, was overthrown August 12th, 1792.

[5] Terneau, t. iii. p. 44.

bility, have joined him, and the Marseillese and pikemen might easily have been dispersed.[1] Thus he might have saved the King and Constitution, but he wanted resolution for so bold a stroke, and only did enough to insure his own fall. The Government superseded him, and, on the night of August 19th, he fled with many of his officers, hoping to reach the Dutch frontier and England; but he was arrested by the Austrian outposts, transferred for some unknown reason to Prussian custody, and successively imprisoned at Wesel, Neisse, and Glatz.[2] Dumouriez was now appointed Commander-in-Chief of the two armies which covered the frontiers, and Luckner was superseded by Kellermann.

The allies were now advancing. The Prussian light troops had entered the French territory, August 12th. Some of the inhabitants of Sierck having fired upon them from their windows, that place was abandoned to military execution; a *début* which produced a bad impression.[3] The main body of the Prussian army, which had taken three weeks to accomplish forty leagues, crossed the frontier, August 18th, and encamped at Tiercelet, where it formed a junction with the Austrians under Clairfait. Longwy, invested by the Duke of Brunswick and General Clairfait, August 20th, capitulated on the 24th. This event was seized upon by the Jacobin leaders, who artfully fomented the excitement which it naturally produced. The Assembly decreed that every citizen, in a besieged place, who talked of surrender, should be put to death; that Longwy should be razed, and a new levy of 30,000 men made.[4] On August 27th was given a grand funeral fête, in honour of those who had fallen on the 10th; the passions of the people were roused by a long procession of their widows and orphans. Next day Danton declared in the Assembly that the despots could be made to retreat only by "a great national convulsion," insisted on the necessity of seizing all traitors; demanded authority to make domiciliary visits, for the purpose, as he said, of seizing the arms of suspected persons.[5] These visits were made, by order of the *Commune*, on the night of August 29th, when several

[1] Von Sybel, vol. ii. p. 51 sqq. (Eng. Transl.). Dumouriez says that two-thirds of the army of Flanders were with Lafayette, *ibid.* p. 51.

[2] Terneau, t. iii. p. 72 sq. At the Peace of Basle, 1795, the Prussians handed him over to Austria. He was now confined at Olmütz, and was at length released by Bonaparte at the Peace of Campo Formio, after a harsh confinement of four years.

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 436.

[4] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 126. It was in the midst of these alarms that several distinguished foreigners were admitted to French citizenship, as Priestley, Payne, Bentham, Wilberforce, Clarkson, Mackintosh, Pestalozzi, Washington, Hamilton, Maddison, Klopstock, Kosciusko, &c.—*Fastes de la Révol.* ap. Blanc, t. vii. p. 117.

[5] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 214.

thousand persons were arrested, but the greater part were released on the following day. The Assembly at last made an endeavour to stem the insolent assumption of authority by the *Commune*, and decreed, August 30th, the election of a new Municipality; but Pétion appeared at the bar at the head of a deputation on the 31st, and frightened the Chamber into an abandonment of the measure. On this occasion, Tallien, who read the address, uttered this ominous sentence, *inserted with Robespierre's own hand*:[1] "We have caused the refractory priests to be arrested; they are confined in a private house, and in a few days the soil of liberty will be purged of their presence!"[2]

On Sunday morning, September 2nd, news arrived at Paris that Verdun had been invested; that the Duke of Brunswick, in summoning it, had declared that places which did not surrender would be abandoned to the fury of the soldiery.[3] The *Commune* now directed the barriers to be closed, horses to be seized to convey troops to the frontier; citizens to hold themselves in readiness to march at the first signal. Alarm-guns were fired, the *tocsin* was rung, the *générale* beaten. These measures had the intended effect. "Let us fly to meet the enemy!" cried the people. But another portion, better instructed, shouted: "Let us hasten to the prisons," —which had just been filled—"shall we leave these traitors behind us, to murder our wives and children if we perish?" A rational fear of a few thousand unarmed prisoners!

Such was the beginning of the horrible MASSACRES OF SEPTEMBER. The first victims were some priests, who were being conveyed in carriages to the prison of the Abbaye, about half-past two in the afternoon; several of whom were murdered before they reached the prison. When the carriages entered the court it was found to be filled with a multitude of people, who must have been admitted by the authorities. The massacre at this place lasted till five o'clock, when a voice exclaimed, "There is nothing more to be done here; let us go to the Carmelites." This prison contained 186 ecclesiastics and three laymen. The priests were asked whether they would take the civic oath? and on their heroically refusing, they were conducted to the garden of the convent, and despatched with muskets and swords. Only fourteen contrived to escape over the walls. About six in the evening an officer of the National Guard informed the General Council of the Municipality of what was passing. This body could, doubtless, have arrested the mas-

[1] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 175 note.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. pp. 163—167.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 336.

sacres, had they been so inclined, by ordering out the National Guard; but they contented themselves with sending commissaries to the different prisons to protect persons incarcerated for debt; thus showing that they had the power to save the rest, had they been so disposed, and, therefore, virtually sanctioning their murder. They went through the farce of sending a message to the Assembly to deliberate respecting the crowds assembled at the prisons.[1] But the Assembly was frightened and powerless. All it did was to send some commissaries, who, after a few vain attempts to be heard, retired. The prisoners were subjected to a sort of burlesque trial. Maillard, the grim hero of the Bastille, acted the part of judge; ten armed men, seated at a table, formed an extempore jury. Similar scenes passed at the other prisons during five consecutive days. The verdict, "Liberate the gentleman," was the signal to kill the unhappy wretch who thought he had escaped. Some who boldly avowed that they were Royalists were spared; any equivocation or falsehood was attended with certain death. A young lady, Mdlle. Sombreuil, saved her father by consenting to drink a glass of wine mixed with human blood.[2] Among the victims were the Minister Montmorin, and the beautiful Princess de Lamballe, one of the Queen's favourites, who was murdered because she refused the oath of hatred of Royalty. Her body was subjected to the most obscene brutalities; her head was cut off, stuck on a pike, and paraded before the Temple, when a municipal officer insisted that the Queen should go to the window. She fainted at the sight. When the murderers had cleared the chief prisons, they went to the Bicêtre and La Salpêtrière, and massacred women and children, paupers and lunatics. While these revolting scenes were enacting, Danton, Desmoulins, Fabre d'Eglantine, and Robert, with their wives, sat down to a luxurious banquet. The total number of victims at Paris is reckoned at between 1,400 and 1,500,[3] to whom must be added the prisoners detained at Orleans—forty-three in number. Alquier, President of the Department Seine et Oise, rode post-haste to Paris to intreat Danton to spare them; he was told by the "Minister of Justice!" to mind his own business. These prisoners were all massacred but three, September 9th. Among them were the ex-Minister De Lessart and the Duke de Brissac, formerly commander of the King's guard. The ruffian Fournier, called the

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 350.

[2] See Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 288 note.

[3] Prudhomme, *Hist. gen. et impart.* ap. Gr. de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 240 sq.; L. Blanc, t. vii. p. 196. M. Terneau (t. iii. p. 548) estimates them at 1368.

American, but who was in reality a native of Auvergne, leader of the band which committed this massacre, had a regular commission from Roland, Minister of the Interior.[1]

The Committee of Surveillance addressed a circular to the different departments, September 3rd, calling upon them to follow the bloody example set by the capital, as a necessary means of public safety. This circular, which bears among other signatures that of Marat, was forwarded with the counter-sign of Danton. It is not so generally known that Danton added a circular of his own, exhorting the inhabitants of the provincial towns to fly to arms and leave nobody behind who might trouble them during the march against the enemy.[2] The exhortations produced, however, but little effect, and, on the whole, the Septembrists failed in the provinces. At Rheims about eight persons were murdered, eleven at Lyon, fourteen at Meaux. At the last place the assassins are said to have come from Paris.[3]

There can be no doubt that the September massacres were premeditated, though a few ultra-revolutionary writers, including M. Louis Blanc, have maintained the contrary. They appear to have been determined on at latest by August 26th, and probably one of the chief objects of them was to influence the elections for the Convention.[4] It can be proved that the Ministry knew of them beforehand; that the *concierges* and other authorities at the prisons were prepared for what was to happen; that the assassins, consisting chiefly of Marseillese and Federal soldiers, were quietly admitted into the prisons; that great part of them were hired and paid for their bloody work;[5] that records of the Sections still existing, as those of the Sections Luxembourg and Poisonnière, show that the massacres were deliberately voted; and that the

[1] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 368. For details of the massacres, see the *Relation* of the Abbé Sicard, and Jourgniac St. Méard, *Mon agonie de 38 heures*, in Barrière's *Biblioth. des Mém.* t. xviii.

[2] From the archives of Angers, ap. Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 548, vol. ii. p. 99 (Eng. Trans.).

[3] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 433 sqq.; Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 292.

[4] Von Sybel (*ibid.* p. 69).

[5] M. L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. vii. p. 206, denies this fact; asserts that no traces can be found in the accounts of the *Commune* of wages paid to the executioners, and contends that any entries of money paid to workmen at this time relate only to the burial of the bodies. But though he has diligently used the *Hist. Parlementaire*, he seems to have overlooked the following passage: "Mandat du 4 Sept. signé N—, Je—, La—, commissaires de la Commune, visé Me—: au profit de Gil—Pet—, pour prix du temps qu'ils ont mis, lui et trois de ses camarades à l'expédition des prêtres de St. Firmin pendant 2 jours, suivant la réquisition qui est faite aux dits commissaires par la section des Sans Culottes, qui les a mis en ouvrage, ci . . . 48 liv."—*H. P.* t. xviii. p. 231. The word *expédition*, evidently a euphemism, can hardly mean *burial*. See further respecting payment of the murderers, Gr. de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 240; Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. note xviii. This last note may be considered as decisive of the question of organization.

same thing was done in other places may be inferred from the circumstance that in the registers of several Sections the leaves containing the transactions of September 2nd and 3rd are torn out.[1] A further proof of foreknowledge and design is that many prisoners were liberated by the leaders of the *Commune* before the massacres began, either from private friendship, or for the sake of money. The Prince de Poix and Beaumarchais bought their lives of Panis and Manuel.[2] But there were doubtless some volunteer assassins. It is said that among the murderers at the Abbaye were persons established as apparently respectable tradesmen in the neighbourhood, and that the murderers of the priests at the Carmes were well-dressed men armed with fowling-pieces, and belonging evidently to the wealthier class.[3]

The chief instigators of the massacres were Danton, Marat, and the Committee of Surveillance; one of the principal agents of them was Billaud Varennes. At the prison of La Force, members of the Municipality, in their scarves of office, presided over and legalized the butchery.[4] Robespierre's share in these atrocities, if more obscure, is hardly less certain. He was too wary to take any prominent part. But that he had a foreknowledge of the massacres appears from the fact, that he, as well as Tallien and others, reclaimed from the prisons some priests who had been their tutors.[5] Panis, one of the most active of the Committee of Surveillance, was Robespierre's creature, acting only by his command. Robespierre afterwards endeavoured to exculpate himself by some glaring falsehoods. He affirmed that he had ceased to go to the *Commune* before the massacres occurred; yet the minutes record his presence September 1st and 2nd.[6] Pétion also declared that he saw Robespierre at the Hôtel de Ville *during the massacres*, and reproached him with the part he had taken in the denunciations and arrests.[7]

The Girondists are not exempt from blame, though their part in the massacres was that of cowardly connivance. We have mentioned Roland's agency in the matter of the Orleans prisoners. The journals published under the patronage of the Minister of the Interior represented the massacres as necessary and just.[8] Pétion, when applied to by men bespattered with blood for orders respect-

[1] The proceedings of all the Sections will be found in Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. note xiii. See also Sorel, *Le Couvent des Carmes*, ch. ix.; Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iv. p. 132.

[2] Prudhomme, ap Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 530.

[3] Blanc, t. vii. pp. 154, 214.

[4] Michelet, t. iv. p. 175.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 121.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 124.

[7] Prudhomme, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 240. M. Blanc omits this anecdote.

[8] Blanc, t. vii. p. 186 sq.

ing eighty prisoners at La Force, exclaimed, "Do for the best!" and offered the assassins some wine.[1] Brissot was publicly charged by Chabot with having informed him, on the morning of September 2nd, of the plot to massacre the prisoners.[2] When it was too late, the Girondists bestirred themselves a little, and procured the dissolution of the Committee of Surveillance.

The massacres were attended and followed in Paris by the greatest disorders. The populace broke into the royal cellars in the Carrousel, and, in their new capacity of sovereign, appropriated the contents. Watches and trinkets were demanded in the streets as offerings to the country. The *Garde Meuble* was broken open and many of the crown diamonds stolen, among them the celebrated *Regent*. Sargent, Panis, Deforgues, and other members of the Municipal Committee, divided the spoils of the murdered.[3] The property stolen must have amounted to many million francs.

From these revolting scenes we turn with pleasure to view the French character on a brighter side. With patriotic enthusiasm volunteers enrolled themselves in great numbers; during a fortnight 1,800 men left Paris daily for the frontier.[4] The Marseillese, however, the perpetrators of the massacres, who had been maintained at the expense of the *Commune*, refused to march.[5] Marat proclaimed that he had other work for them to do at Paris. Patriotic gifts poured in; even the market women brought 4,000 francs. Verdun had surrendered, September 2nd, after a bombardment of fifteen hours; but the suicide of Beaurepaire, the commandant, who had opposed the capitulation, might apprize the Prussians of the resistance they were likely to meet. Dumouriez who had only 25,000 men to oppose to the much superior forces of the Duke of Brunswick, had determined to occupy the forest of Argonne, a branch of the Ardennes which separates the Trois Evêchés from Champagne Pouilleuse, and to make it the Thermopylæ of France.[6] But being driven from two of the passes he had occupied, and a superior force of the allies threatening to turn his flank, he retreated in the night of September 14th to St. Menehould. Here he was joined by Kellermann and Bournonville with their divisions, which brought up his army to more than 50,000 men. The Prussians attacked Kellermann at Valmy,

[1] Evidence of Chabot in the trial of the Girondists. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. pp. 49, 71, 88, 106.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xx. p. 444.

[3] *Archives de la Seine*, ap. Michelet, *Révol.* t. v. p. 117; *Idem.* t. iv. p. 223.

[4] *Hist. Parl.* t. xviii. p. 333.

[5] Terneau, t. iii. p. 126.

[6] For this campaign see the *Mémoires* of Dumouriez, t. iii.

September 20th, but the Duke of Brunswick withdrew the columns which had been formed, and were actually marching to storm the heights, to the great chagrin of the King of Prussia, who was present, and had ordered the advance. The Duke de Chartres, eldest son of the Duke of Orleans, and his brother, the Duke de Montpensier, were present at this battle, which was little more than a cannonade. It had, however, important consequences. The Prussians, deceived by the representations of the French emigrants, that their advance would be a mere military promenade, had not provided themselves with magazines; the peasants had laid waste the surrounding country, bad weather set in, the roads became almost impracticable, the men were suffering severely from dysentery. The stories about the Duke of Brunswick having been tampered with by the French are most probably false, but it is certain that he did not push the war with much ardour.[1] Instead of advancing on Châlons, as the King of Prussia, the Russian, Austrian, and emigrant parties desired, the Duke renewed negotiations with Dumouriez; offered much milder conditions than those previously threatened; said nothing about restoring the ancient *régime*; demanded only the release of the King, and the cessation of all propagandism. Dumouriez would have willingly made a separate peace with Prussia; but the Convention had now assembled; the Executive Council refused to listen to any terms till the French territory had been evacuated; and Dumouriez, in reply to the Duke's proposals, handed to the Prussian envoy the decree establishing a Republic! There was now nothing left to the Prussians but to retreat, and Dumouriez, authorized by Danton, did not molest them. They crossed the Rhine at Coblenz towards the end of October, and Dumouriez returned to Paris to enjoy his success[2] and arrange a plan of operations against Belgium. On the 17th of October King Frederick William II. wrote to the Empress Catharine that the inclemency of the weather had forced him to retreat; that he should not forsake the great cause, but that he must be compensated with a still larger share of Poland! At the same time Austria was urging on the Russian Court her claim to Baireuth and Anspach; and Francis II., in a letter to the King of Prussia (October 29th), expressed his resolution to act with him against the common enemy, and at the same time to procure the compensation to which both were entitled.[3]

The National Convention charged with the drawing up of a

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. i. pp. 351, 481, &c.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 179 sq.; *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 496 sq.
[3] Von Sybel, ii. 185 sqq. (Eng. Tr.).

new Constitution, assembled September 21st. The Girondists, or Brissotins, who had sat on the left or opposition benches in the Legislative, formed the right of the Convention. In appearance they had the superiority. They occupied the Ministry, they had a majority in the Assembly, and were supported by the moderate party. But they had placed themselves in a false position. They had gone too far for the Constitutionalists, and not far enough for the ultra-democrats and Jacobins. Opposite to them in terrible array was the faction of the MOUNTAIN, so called from the members of it occupying the highest benches on the left. The nucleus of this faction was formed by the twenty-four Parisian deputies and some violent Republicans from the Departments. The election of deputies had commenced at Paris, September 2nd, and there can be no doubt that the massacres had a vast influence on the returns.[1] The list, headed by Robespierre and closed by the Duke of Orleans, now called Philippe Egalité,[2] contains, among other names notorious in the annals of the Revolution, those of Danton, Collot d'Herbois, Manuel, Billaud Varennes, Camille Desmoulins, Marat, Legendre the butcher, Panis, Sergent, Fréron, Fabre d'Eglantine, Robespierre's brother Augustine, David the painter, &c. The Duke of Orleans, by accepting a seat in the Convention, identified himself with the mortal enemies of the King, his relative. Towards the end of 1791 a reconciliation had been attempted through Bertrand de Moleville. The King received the Duke and appeared entirely satisfied. But when the latter attended the levée on the following Sunday, the courtiers pressed round him, trod on his toes, and drove him to the door. Other insults followed so marked and numerous that he was compelled to retire. On descending the stairs he was spit upon. From this moment he abandoned himself to an implacable hatred, and vowed to revenge himself on the King and Queen.[3] The strength of the Mountain lay, not in their number, but in their being supported by the Jacobin Club, the *Commune*, and consequently the Parisian populace, then the supreme power in the State. They had succeeded in driving the Jacobins from the

[1] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 192; Croker, *Essays, &c.* p. 346; Michelet, t. iv. pp. 206, 217.

[2] The origin of this name is thus explained: all persons absent from France having been placed on the list of *émigrés*, and the Duke of Orleans's daughter, with her governess, Madame de Genlis, being in England for purposes of education, the Duke went to the Hôtel de Ville, to solicit the striking out of their names. Manuel said, that no petition in the name of Bourbon could be received, and pointing to the statue of *Egalité*, invited the Duke to take it for his god-mother, which he did to save his child. *Revue Rétrosp.* 2 Sér. No. viii. ap. Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 395.

[3] Bertrand de Moleville, *Mém.* t. i. p. 278 sq.

Club, and had filled their places with *Sans-culottes*. Between the Gironde and the Mountain, voting sometimes with one, sometimes with the other, was seated the *Plain*, or the *Marsh* (*Marais*), consisting principally of new members without settled political connections. Their principles generally inclined them to the *Right*, but terror often compelled them to vote with the *Left*.[1]

The Convention, on the very first day it assembled, although only 371 members were present out of 749, decreed, on the motion of the Abbé Grégoire, the abolition of royalty.[2] This event had been prepared in the Legislative Assembly. At the instance of Chabot, September 4th, all the members had cried, "No King!" and taken an oath of eternal hatred to royalty.[3] On September 22nd, the Republic was proclaimed under the windows of the Temple. Louis XVI. heard, it is said, the sentence of deposition without emotion, and continued to read a book on which he was engaged. It was now ordered that the date of *fourth year of liberty* should be altered to *first of the Republic*.

A struggle for power between the Girondists and the Mountain was inevitable. The Girondists charged their adversaries with promoting social anarchy in order to establish a dictatorship; while the Mountain denounced the Girondists as aiming to divide France into several Federated Republics, after the manner of the United States of America; nay, they even imputed to them a design to restore royalty by means of a civil war. These were the war-cries of the two parties. Danton made some attempt to conciliate them, but without success. It was the Girondists who began the attack. Brissot preluded it by an article in his Journal, September 23rd;[4] and Kersaint followed it up next day by a speech in the Convention. The massacres were made the chief topic of offence. "It is time," exclaimed Kersaint, "to erect scaffolds for assassins, and for those who promote assassination;" adding, "Perhaps, it requires some courage to speak of assassins in this place."[5] Barbaroux was put forward to made a desultory and unformal attack upon Robespierre, which led to nothing. The debate is chiefly remarkable for the first appearance in public of Marat. The Convention was not composed of very scrupulous persons; yet, when Marat mounted the tribune he was greeted with universal shouts of astonishment and horror. "I have a

[1] Thos. Payne had been returned for the Pas de Calais, Dr. Priestley for the Department of the Orne, and Anacharsis Clootz for that of the Oise. Priestley declined to serve because he did not speak French.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 81.

[3] *Ibid.* t. xvii. p. 437.

[4] *Patriote Français*, No. 1140.

[5] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 59.

great many personal enemies here," he coolly remarked. "All, All!" exclaimed the deputies, rising simultaneously. Nothing daunted, Marat went on to defend Robespierre. In the course of his speech he avowed having incited the people to the massacres, and concluded it with denouncing the Assembly as useless.[1] Cries now arose on all sides, "To the Abbaye! to the Abbaye!" But Marat outbraved all attempts to put him down. He had an inexhaustible fund of self-love and self-conceit. In a debate on October 4th, he declared his contempt for the decrees of the Assembly, and replied to the bursts of laughter which this excited by exclaiming, "No! you cannot hinder the man of genius from throwing himself into the future—you cannot appreciate the man of education who knows the world and anticipates events."[2] He despised the people, whose friend he called himself, and to whose blood-thirsty passions he pandered.[3] His cynicism, his filthy exterior and affectation of austere poverty, were but masks. He was not half so dirty at home as abroad. His cadaverous complexion, his greenish eyes, his greasy locks, bound up in a Madras handkerchief, his well-worn apparel, made his person squalid and disgusting; but his rooms are said to have been adorned with silk draperies, flowers, gilding, luxurious ottomans.[4]

On October 8th Buzot proposed to the Convention a project for a departmental guard of 4,470 men. The scheme was violently denounced at the Jacobins and in Robespierre's Journal. "The two preceding Assemblies had not needed any guard; now, when a Republic was established, the Convention could exist only by the means which support a tyranny! Was not the Assembly guarded by Frenchmen? What were the Parisians but a portion of the French people?" But the strongest arguments against the measure were the threatening deputations from the Sections, and especially from the Faubourg St. Antoine. The Girondists were compelled to abandon their guard; but the arrival of a third band of Marseillese, under the auspices of Barbaroux, encouraged them to proceed to their attacks upon the Mountain. On October 29th, Louvet, the author of the licentious novel of *Faublas*, made a formal, but rambling accusation of Robespierre,[5] when Barère assisted his escape by an insult. "If," he said, "there was in the Assembly a man like Cæsar, Cromwell, or Sylla, he would accuse

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 97 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Thus, for instance, he exclaims in his Journal: "Eternal asses (*badauds*), with what epithets would I not overwhelm you, if I knew any more humiliating than that *of Parisians!*"—*L'Ami du Peuple*, No. 402, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 419.

[4] Madame Roland, *Mémoires*, t. ii. p. 227 (ed. Berville et Barrière, 1827).

[5] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 422 sqq.

him, for such men were dangerous to liberty; but the little dabblers in revolutions, politicians of the hour, who would never enter the domain of history, were not worthy to occupy the valuable time of the Assembly." He then moved that they should pass to the order of the day: which was accordingly done.[1]

We must now revert to the war on the frontiers. After the retreat of the Prussians, the French General Custine, who was acting against the Austrians, had pushed on with his division to Spires, which he took by a *coup de main*. Learning here that the French would be welcomed as deliverers in the Rhenish provinces, he sent a detachment of 4,500 men to Worms, who were received with open arms; and he published a proclamation containing the democratic maxim then in vogue: "War to the palace, peace to the cottage."[2] Custine appeared before Mentz, October 19th, which place surrendered on the 21st. Here he opened a club on the model of the Jacobins, and was joined by many ecclesiastics, eager to break their vows; while the peasants also manifested a disposition to rise. Another French corps had occupied Frankfort without resistance, October 22nd. These successes, however, were not unmixed with reverses. Bournonville, repulsed in an attempt upon Trèves at an advanced season of the year, retired into Lorraine. Custine, instead of seizing Coblenz, whither the Elector of Mentz had fled with his Court after the capture of his capital, remained inactive, bribed, it is said, by the Prussians; he also neglected the defence of Frankfort, which the Prussians re-entered, December 2nd.

In conformity with their scheme of revolutionizing all Europe, the French had also declared war against the King of Sardinia; a French army under General Montesquiou soon after entered Savoy, and occupied Chambéry, September 23rd. The Savoyards received the French with open arms. Hence Montesquiou was to have pushed on to Geneva, threatening Switzerland and Italy; but his negotiations with the Genevese displeased the Assembly; his impeachment was decreed, and it was with difficulty that he saved himself by flying to Geneva itself.[3] About the same time a French division under General Anselme entered Nice, and captured Villa Franca on the first summons.[4]

Meanwhile on the side of Flanders, the Austrians, under Duke Albert of Saxe-Teschen, had bombarded Lille, but without effect;

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xx. p. 221 sq.
[2] *Homme d'etat.* t. ii. p. 46. See this work for the whole campaign, t. i. pp. 433-519, t. ii. pp. 1-99.
[3] Von Sybel, ii. 163 sq. (Eng. Transl.).
[4] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 189 sq.

and finding themselves deserted by the Prussians, had taken up, under Clairfait, a fortified position at Jemappes, near Mons. Here they were attacked and defeated by Dumouriez, now appointed General of the army of the Ardennes (November 6th). The Duke de Chartres (Louis Philippe) was present in this action. The victory of Jemappes opened Belgium to the French; Mons, Brussels, Liége, Namur, Antwerp, and other places, fell successively into their hands; and by the middle of December the conquest of the Austrian Netherlands was completed. The Jacobins now sent agents thither to propagate their revolutionary doctrines. But the Flemings, who had at first received the French with enthusiasm, soon discovered that their yoke was heavier than that of their former masters; were disgusted by the requisitions made upon them, and a system of general pillage. Dumouriez, who disapproved these things, and had a scheme for the conquest of Holland, to which the Girondists were opposed, now came to Paris to remonstrate. He wished also to baffle the Jacobins and rescue the King from their hands. In addition to these successes, a French fleet had appeared in November before Naples, and had compelled the Bourbon King to recognize the French Republic —the first acknowledgment of it by a foreign Power.

On December 3rd the Convention decreed that Louis XVI. should be brought to trial before them. A committee of twenty-four which had been named to examine the papers found at the Tuileries, delivered a report conceived in a spirit of the most virulent hostility towards the King.[1] His death had been demanded by deputations of the sections, and in addresses from the affiliated Jacobin Clubs, and had been represented in puppet shows in the public streets and squares. The Constitution had declared the King inviolable, and his Ministers responsible. The only head under which he could be arraigned was treasonable negotiations with foreign Powers, for which the penalty was abdication; but that penalty he had already paid on the 10th of August. It was necessary, therefore, to abandon all appeal to the law, and to substitute the plea of State necessity, of which the Sovereign People was the judge, and the Convention as its representative. In a debate on November 13th the fanatical St. Just contended that the King could not be judged as a citizen, but as an enemy; that he was not included in the national contract, and could not, therefore, be tried by the civil law, but by the law of

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xx. p. 239 sqq. It charged Louis, among other things, with being an *accaparcur*, or forestaller of sugar, wheat, and coffee.

nations. He denounced the inoffensive Louis as another Catiline, complained that the eighteenth century was less advanced than the age of Cæsar; then the tyrant was immolated in the Senate with no other formalities than twenty-two dagger thrusts, with regard to no other laws than the liberty of Rome.[1] Robespierre adopted the arguments of his friend St. Just. Louis, he exclaimed, is King, the Republic is founded; either then Louis is already condemned, or the Republic is not acquitted. You invoke the Constitution in his favour; but the Constitution forbids what you have already done; go, fling yourselves at his feet and implore his mercy![2] The Ministry and the majority of the Convention were also for a trial, in order to promote their foreign propagandism by the terror which it would inspire. But when they found that England, instead of favouring their views, had been completely alienated by the September massacres, and might probably institute a war of vengeance for the King's death,[3] they changed their tone, especially as they began to feel some apprehensions about their own fate; for the attacks of the Jacobins were now directed against them as well as the King. They proposed, indeed, that the trial should proceed, but they hoped to avert the sentence by demanding that it should be ratified by the primary electors. A futile method! for the *sans-culottes* of Paris were the real arbiters of the question, and to get the better of them was a plain impossibility. For though the great mass of the people sympathized with the King and the Gironde, the Mountain prevailed by its unscrupulous audacity, and the better classes were paralyzed by fear.

While Louis was thus savagely denounced, he and his family were leading a most exemplary life at the Temple. The King rose at six o'clock and devoted himself to religious exercises. At nine the family assembled for breakfast, after which Louis instructed his son in Latin and geography; Marie Antoinette gave lessons to her daughter; while Madame Elizabeth read books of devotion or employed herself with needlework. At one, the family again met for dinner; after which the children played together, while the King and Queen played a game of chess or piquet, or took a walk in the wretched garden, but under the inspection of two municipal officers. Nine was the hour for bedtime, when Louis, having given his blessing to his family, concluded the day, as he had begun it, with exercises of devotion.

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xx. p. 330. [2] *Idem*, t. xxi. p. 162 sqq.
[3] Von Sybel ii. p. 273 sq. (Eng. Tr.).

But they were not suffered to enjoy even this quiet life without molestation. Pétion appointed as their warder the ferocious vagabond who had threatened the King's life on June 20th. This fellow took a pleasure in annoying the royal prisoners: sometimes he would sing the *Carmagnole* before them; sometimes, knowing that the Queen disliked tobacco, he would puff it in her face. Manuel, with a malicious pleasure, related to the King the victories of the Republic, and ordered all his decorations and orders to be removed.[1]

On December 10th the accusation of the King was read to the Convention. The principal charges alleged against him were: his having suspended the sittings of the National Assembly, June 20th, and subsequently attempted to dictate to and overawe it; having collected troops to support despotism by force; having caused many persons to be killed at the siege of the Bastille, and having ordered the governor to hold out to the last extremity; having summoned the regiment of Flanders to Versailles, followed by the *fête* of the *gardes du corps*, &c.; having sanctioned Bouillé's massacre at Nanci; having corrupted Mirabeau and others; the flight to Varennes and manifest drawn up on that occasion; having caused the people to be fired on in the Champ de Mars; having kept secret the Convention of Pilnitz, of which he was the head; having paid large sums of money to the emigrants; having purposely neglected the army, thus causing the fall of Longwy and Verdun; having neglected the navy; having provoked the insurrection of August 10th in order to massacre the people, &c. But this last charge was felt to be so shameless that it was subsequently withdrawn.[2]

On the following day Louis was brought before the Convention to be interrogated on these charges. Some he justified, some he denied; of some he declared that he had no knowledge, of others he threw the responsibility on his Ministers. Nor must it be concealed that his denials were sometimes not only in the face of facts, but even of his own handwriting. He disclaimed all knowledge of an iron safe found in the walls of the Tuileries, and of the papers it contained. Some of these revealed Mirabeau's venality; in consequence of which his bust at the Jacobins was overthrown, and that in the Convention veiled till his guilt should be more fully proved.

[1] *Journal* de Cléry (containing the *Récitdes évènements arrivés au Temple*, by the King's daughter); *Hist. abregée de la Révol. et des malheurs qu'elle a occasionnés*, t. ii. liv. ii.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxi. pp. 259-276.

Louis, after a furious resistance of the Mountain, was allowed counsel for his defence; and he selected Target and Tronchet for that purpose. Target being too ill to act, Lamoignon de Malesherbes volunteered to supply his place. When that venerable old man appeared at the Temple, Louis embraced him and exclaimed: "Your sacrifice is the more generous, as you will expose your own life without being able to save mine!" Both Malesherbes and Tronchet being old and feeble, they procured, with the consent of the Assembly, the aid of Desèze, a young and brilliant advocate of Bordeaux. When the King was arraigned, December 26th, Desèze made a powerful speech in his defence. Dividing the heads of accusation into things done before and things done after the King's acceptance of the Constitution, he argued that the former were covered by that act, the latter by the inviolability which the Constitution conferred upon him; and he concluded with a glowing eulogium on Louis's virtues, his benevolence, his mildness, and his justice. After his counsel had concluded, the King read a short address, in which he only protested against the imputation of having shed his subjects' blood on August 10th.[1]

When Louis had retired it was decreed, on the motion of Couthon, that the debate on the judgment of Louis Capet should be continued without interruption till sentence had been pronounced. The Girondists, either from a sentiment of compassion, or for their own political ends, wished to save the King's life. Vergniaud's speech deprecating regicide was a masterpiece of eloquence. The Girondists proposed an appeal to the people, which, *as sovereign*, possesses the prerogative of mercy, and ought, therefore, to be consulted. This was opposed by Robespierre and Marat. Robespierre, the cold-blooded and sophistical disciple of Rousseau, now showed, by excellent arguments, the absurdity and inconvenience of consulting the people on affairs of State;[2] yet, if they were competent to decide any political question at all, surely none more simple could be submitted to them than that of the condemnation or acquittal of the King. The appeal was lost; and it was decided that the question, as to the King's guilt, should be put on January 14th, 1793. The Convention, during the interval, exhibited scenes of the most extraordinary violence. To work upon the passions of the people and of the deputies, a procession of the wounded of August 10th, accompanied by the widows and orphans of the slain, defiled through the Convention;

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxii. p. 57. [2] *Ibid.* p. 103 sqq.

the orator of the Sections called for the death of Louis, the infamous assassin of thousands of Frenchmen![1] In discussing the King's fate, the Girondists and Mountain seemed, observes M. L. Blanc, to be contending over his corpse. The members of the different sides rushed one upon another as if about to engage in a general fight; vociferous cries continued for hours, during which nobody could be heard; the President broke his bell in vain attempts to restore order.

On January 14th the three following questions were submitted to the Convention:—1. Is Louis guilty? 2. Shall the decision of the Assembly on this point, whatever it may be, be submitted to the people for ratification? 3. What punishment has Louis incurred?

The first of these questions was decided almost unanimously in the affirmative. The second was negatived by a majority of 423 against 281. The debate on the King's punishment commenced on January 16th. The public flocked to the sitting, as to a fête or opera; bets were made upon the result; women, elegantly dressed and decked with tricolour ribbons, filled the tribunes; wine and refreshments circulated; any trivial incident, as the appearance of a sick deputy carried in to vote, excited the mirth of this gay and heartless crowd; among it might be observed a few serious faces, while some were marked with ferocity and fury.

Danton, who had returned to Paris only that day, proposed and carried a motion, that the King's fate should be decided by an absolute majority, instead of a majority of two-thirds, as usual in criminal cases. It had been determined that the members should give their votes by the *appel nominal*, that is, by calling their names. This was commenced at eight o'clock on the evening of the 16th. The Girondists had been alarmed by threats of fresh massacres. Already some twenty votes had been recorded, most of them for death, when the name of Vergniaud was called, the eloquent leader of the Gironde. A breathless silence prevailed; his vote would probably guide the rest of his party, and thus decide the King's fate. It was for death! but he asked, with a sort of shuffling evasion, as if ashamed of his vote, whether execution would be deferred? Philippe Egalité pronounced his relative's condemnation without any visible emotion, observing: "Guided only by duty, and persuaded that those who have attempted, or shall attempt, anything contrary to the sove-

[1] *Hist. Parl.* p. 131 sqq.

reignty of the people deserve to die, I vote for death!" The *appel* lasted till the evening of January 17th, when the votes were declared. As 721 members were present, the absolute majority would be 361, and exactly this number of members voted for death unconditionally; 26 more pronounced the same sentence, but demanded a discussion whether it should not be deferred; thus making the total majority 387. On the other side, 334 voted for banishment, imprisonment, &c., including 46 who were for death with reprieve.[1] Vergniaud, as President of the Convention, now pronounced the sentence of death. The King's counsel offered some objections to the proceedings, but they were overborne by Robespierre, and the sitting was closed.

On January 19th Brissot and others proposed that the King's execution should be deferred, on the political ground that it would alienate the friends of the Revolution in England and America; but Barère opposed the motion, and it was decided by a majority of 380 against 310 that Louis should be executed within twenty-four hours.[2] Next day the Executive Council, and Garat, as Minister of Justice, officially announced to the King his sentence, which he had previously learnt from Malesherbes. Louis heard his doom without emotion. He made three requests: a respite of three days to prepare himself for death, the services of a priest, and an interview with his family: the last two only were granted. He slept peacefully the night before his execution, and being awakened at five in the morning (January 21st) by his faithful valet, Cléry, received the sacrament at the hands of the Abbé Edgeworth de Firmont. Having had an interview the day before with his family, he resolved not to see them again, in order to spare them the pain of a last separation.

At nine o'clock Santerre arrived with a military force to conduct Louis to the scaffold. The Abbé Edgeworth seems to have entertained a hope that he would be rescued,[3] and something of this sort had been mentioned to the King by M. de Malesherbes; but Louis expressed his disapproval of any such attempt, and said that he would rather die.[4] The melancholy procession passed in unbroken silence through the streets, except a few cries of "Mercy! mercy!" from some women. It arrived at the foot of the scaffold, which had been erected in the Place de la Révolution (now Place de la Concorde), a few minutes before ten

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 206. [2] *Ibid.* p. 269.
[3] *Memoirs of the Abbé Edgeworth*, p. 78 (London, 1815).
[4] *Notes of Madame d'Angoulême*, ap. Croker, *Essays, &c.* p. 257.

o'clock. A little delay occurred through the King's unwillingness to take off his coat, and again from his repugnance to have his hands tied. He attempted to address the people, but the brutal Santerre drowned his voice by ordering the drums to beat, and all that could be heard was a protestation that he died innocent. After the *guillotine* had done its office, the executioner, Sanson, held up the King's head, and the crowd shouted, "The Republic for ever!" Louis XVI. was thirty-nine years of age, of which he had reigned eighteen. His remains were carried to the church of the Madeleine, and consumed with quicklime.[1] When the catastrophe was accomplished Marat exclaimed, "We have burnt our ships behind us!"[2] And indeed nothing was now left for the Jacobins but their own extermination or that of their enemies.

The murder of Louis XVI., for such it must be called, created a great sensation throughout Europe. A general mourning was assumed in England and other countries. The Empress of Russia interdicted all commerce with France, and expelled the French from her dominions, unless they abjured revolutionary principles, and renounced all commerce with their native country.[3] Spain prepared to take up arms, nor could the sentiments of the Court of Naples be doubtful, where Caroline of Austria, sister of Marie Antoinette, ruled in the name of her husband. The Papal Court had denounced the proceedings in France before the King's execution, and Basseville, the French Secretary of Legation at Rome, had been murdered for taking down the royal arms at his hotel, and substituting those of the Republic. Spain alone, however, of all the neutral Powers, had made any attempt to save Louis; but the Convention refused to consider the application.[4] The Marquis of Lansdowne and Mr. Fox in the British Parliament had moved for some intervention in favour of the King, and the opposition of Mr. Pitt and the Ministry has been attributed by some French historians to the most sinister and unworthy motives.[5] But, as Mr. Pitt stated in the House of Commons, the

[1] M. L. Blanc, who represents the conduct of Louis on this occasion in the most invidious light, affirms among other things that he had a sort of struggle with the executioner; but nothing of the kind appears in the extracts from the newspapers in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 298 sq., giving an account of his death. M. Blanc seems strangely to have overlooked Sanson's letter to the editor of the *Thermomètre du jour*. Surely there could not have been better authority. See Croker, p. 255.

[2] Von Sybel, vol. ii. p. 295 (Eng. Transl.).

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 191; Garden, *Hist des Traités*, t. v. p. 195.

[4] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxii. p. 98; Montgaillard, t. iii. p. 314.

[5] Michelet, *Hist. de la Rév. Fr.* t. v. p. 318; L. Blanc, *ibid.* t. viii. p. 92, &c. M. Blanc charges Pitt with displaying

intervention of England would only have alarmed the national pride and jealousy of the French, and have hurried on the very crime which it was intended to prevent; nor could Fox deny the justice of this view.[1] Such, undoubtedly, would have been the effect in the relations then existing between England and France, which we must here briefly describe.

Immediately after August 10th, Lord Gower, the English Ambassador, had been recalled from Paris, on the ground that his credentials were annulled by the imprisonment of the King; but he was instructed, while professing the determination of his royal master to observe strict neutrality in respect to the settlement of the French Government, to express his solicitude for the situation of Louis XVI. and his family, and to deprecate any act of violence towards them.[2] The Marquis de Chauvelin, the French Ambassador at London, with whom M. de Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, was associated as a sort of Mentor, also ceased from the same period, and for similar reasons, to be recognized by the English Court in his official capacity, though he was allowed to remain at London. But, between the French King's imprisonment and execution, the British Cabinet found several just causes of complaint against the proceedings of the Convention, not at all connected with their internal administration. Pache, the French Minister at War, Danton, Robespierre, and their party, had determined on the acquisition of Belgium at any risk; a proceeding which the English Ministry could not regard with indifference, especially as England had guaranteed that country to the Emperor. Their formulated complaints were chiefly three:[3] viz. 1. A Decree of the French Assembly of November 19th (subsequently complemented by another of December 15th), by which they had established a system of revolutionary propagandism and conquest, by directing their generals to proclaim, in the countries which they entered, fraternity, liberty, and equality, the sovereignty of the people, the suppression of the existing authorities, &c. Peoples who refused or renounced liberty and equality were to be treated as enemies. That these principles were also to be applied to England, was shown by the receptions publicly given in France to the King's seditious subjects; 2. A project for the invasion of Holland by the Repub-

"le sang froid le plus cruel," p. 96, a charge rather amusing in the mouth of a defender of the regicides.

[1] Adolphus, *Reign of George III.* vol. v. p. 264.

[2] *Instructions* to Lord Gower, *ibid.* p. 263.

[3] See Lord Grenville's *Letter* in answer to M. Chauvelin's note, *State Papers, Ann. Register*, 1793.

lican armies in Belgium, which had begun to be canvassed by French statesmen after the battle of Jemappes;[1] 3. The proclamation by the French of the freedom of the Scheldt (November 22nd, 1792), showing a total disregard and contempt of the rights of neutral nations. That river, as we have already related (above, p. 225), had been closed by the Treaty of Münster, confirmed by the Treaty of Fontainebleau between the Emperor, as sovereign of the Netherlands, and the United Provinces, *under French mediation*, November 8th, 1785. Yet the Convention haughtily proclaimed that the obstruction of rivers was contrary to those natural rights which all Frenchmen had sworn to maintain, a relic of feudal servitude and odious monopoly. No treaties, it was asserted, could authorize such concessions, and the glory of the Republic demanded that liberty should be established and tyranny overthrown wherever her arms prevailed.[2] Nor was this decree a mere *brutum fulmen;* several French vessels of war had forced a passage up the Scheldt in order to bombard Antwerp. These complaints were aggravated by the insolent and offensive tone in which the Minister Lebrun, as he publicly announced to the Convention, instructed M. de Chauvelin to reply to them; namely, by attempting to separate the British Ministry from the British people, and to establish the latter as the proper judge of the questions at issue; a process, it was intimated, that might lead to consequences of which the Cabinet of St. James's had little dreamt.[3]

Thus France, regardless of all existing treaties, even though sanctioned by her own former Government, was to be the self-constituted arbiter of all international questions; wherever, at least, her arms and her proselyting spirit might prevail. England was called on to resist such pretensions, not alone from motives of general policy, but also by her positive engagements towards Holland, entered into by the Treaty of the Hague, April 15th, 1788.[4] Other grounds of complaint against France were, the annexation of Avignon, Savoy, and Nice, the conquest of Austrian Flanders, &c.; though French statesmen plausibly maintained that these aggregations sufficed only to balance the gains of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, by the dismemberment of Poland.[5] A more particular cause of offence was the attempt to propagate

[1] See Brissot's *Letter* to Dumouriez, in *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 159.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxi. p. 351 sqq. *Ann. Register*. 1792, p. 356; *ibid.* 1793, Lord Grenville's *Letter* to M. de Chauvelin; Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 68.

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 149.

[4] Garden, t. v. p. 89.

[5] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 136.

revolutionary ideas in England by means of Jacobin agents, and even, it was supposed, through Talleyrand and Chauvelin, the French Ministers in London.

The French Revolution had given birth to several democratic and revolutionary clubs in England, and had communicated fresh activity to those which previously existed. Such were the Constitutional Society, the London Corresponding Society, the Friends of the People, &c. The greater part of these societies were in correspondence with the Jacobin Club; nay, their seditious addresses, though expressing the sentiments of only a small portion of the British people, were publicly and favourably received by the Convention. Thomas Payne, an active agent in the French Revolution, had published this year in England the concluding part of his *Rights of Man;* in which he attempted to show that the English Government was utterly bad, and incited the people to mend it by following the example of the French; and a cheap edition of the work had been published to enable every class to read it. Monge, the French Minister of Marine, had written to the Jacobin societies in the seaport towns of France, December 31st, 1792, threatening to make a descent on England, hurl thither 50,000 caps of liberty, destroy the tyranny of the Government, and erect an English Republic on the ruins of the throne.[1] Pitt attached, perhaps, more than their due weight to these and some similar proceedings, which, relying on the good sense of the English people, he might securely have despised. But they were nevertheless acts of hostility, and therefore afforded just ground of complaint.

In this state of feeling between the two nations, the English Government had found themselves compelled to adopt some measures of a hostile tendency. The circulation of *assignats* in England was prohibited; the Government was empowered to prevent the exportation of arms, ammunition, and naval stores; the sending of corn and flour *to France* was forbidden, an invidious measure. On December 1st a proclamation appeared for embodying the militia. The English Ministry appear to have now foreseen that war was inevitable. Towards the end of November they had made communications to the Court of Vienna tending to reanimate the Coalition.[2] The Parliament, which had been prorogued to January 3rd, was summoned to meet December 13th, 1792, when the King, after lamenting in his speech the attempts at

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 177; Smyth's *Lectures*, vol. iii. p. 33.

[2] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 133 sqq.

sedition in England, pursued in concert with persons in foreign countries, remarked that he had observed a strict neutrality in the war, and abstained from interference in the internal affairs of France; but he could not without serious uneasiness observe the strong and increasing indications in that country of an intention to excite disturbances in other States, to disregard the rights of neutral nations, and to pursue views of conquest and aggrandizement, as well as to adopt towards his allies, the States-General (who had been equally neutral), measures neither conformable to the law of nations nor to existing treaties. Under these circumstances he had taken steps for augmenting his naval and military force, and by a firm and temperate conduct to preserve the blessings of peace.[1] This statement may be regarded as the English manifesto. A few days after Lord Grenville introduced an Alien Bill, by which foreigners were placed under surveillance.

All these were no doubt unfriendly steps, and the French added to them the shelter which their emigrants found in England; but they were no more than what the safety of the country demanded, or what had been its usual practice.

On the 28th of January, 1793, four days after the execution of the French King, George III. sent a message to Parliament that, "in consequence of the atrocious act recently perpetrated at Paris," it would be necessary to increase the military and naval forces.[2] In the relations then subsisting between the two countries this step was unavoidable; but it has given rise to a charge against the British Ministry of provoking a war. This, however, is far from the truth, for they had done all they could to avoid one. Pitt's policy had been essentially pacific, directed towards the financial and domestic interests of the country, to which a war would be highly injurious; nay, in common with a large portion of his countrymen, he had viewed with satisfaction the commencement of the French Revolution, and had expressed his wish to see a solid liberty established in France.[3] Brissot himself, a leading member of the Committee of General Defence, and one of the most ardent promoters of a war, was compelled to acknowledge that up to August, 1792, England had observed a scrupulous neutrality, though he, of course, attributes it to unworthy motives.[4] The English Government, at the request of the French, had prohibited their officers and soldiers from entering the

[1] Adolphus, *George III.* vol. v. p. 237.
[2] *Ann. Register*, 1793.
[3] See his speech of February 9th, 1790, in Earl Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. ii. p. 48.
[4] See his *Rapport* to the Convention, January 12th, 1793, in *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 64.

armies of the Coalition. Nay, they had even used their influence to prevent the States-General from joining Austria and Prussia.[1]

In truth, a peace policy would have been simply impossible. The leading members of the Whig party supported Pitt's views, and even Fox himself was compelled to acknowledge that ground for complaint existed.[2] When Fox ventured to divide the House he constantly found himself in small minorities, and it is plain that he could not have carried on the government a single week. For the views of the Ministry were those of the great majority of the nation. An almost universal feeling had been excited against the French by the aggressions before mentioned, inflamed by horror and disgust at the September massacres.[3] This feeling, which is displayed in the Parliamentary speeches of the period, must have been much stronger than anything we can now imagine, and was highly creditable to the English people.[4] But even had the nation suppressed this natural indignation, connived at the insolence and aggressions of the French, and basely truckled to a government of assassins, would war have been avoided? No. The Girondists had determined on propagating their principles of liberty and equality, or rather their own dominion under those sacred names, with the sword. Brissot, in a letter to one of the French Ministers, observes: "Set fire to the four corners of Europe—there lies our safety."[5] "The national thought and the plan of the Girondists," observes a French historian of the Revolution, "*decided on a long while beforehand*, was to take the offensive *in all quarters*, to launch *throughout the world* the crusade of liberty."[6]

The French Government had anticipated the dismissal of M. Chauvelin by recalling him. On February 1st, 1793, the Convention unanimously declared war against the King of England and the Stadholder of the United Provinces.[7] Thus, in point of fact, the French were the aggressors. Yet, at this time, negotiations were actually going on between Lord Auckland, the English Minister at the Hague, and Dumouriez, with the view of preserving peace, and a Conference had been fixed for February

[1] Massey's *Reign of George III.* vol. iv. p. 2. The English grounds for a war will be found very clearly and forcibly stated in this work, ch. xxxiii.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 6.

[3] Brissot, in the report before quoted, confesses that the massacres had alienated the English. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 69.

[4] "Si l'on avait vu la nation Anglaise envoyer des ambassadeurs à des assassins, la vraie force de cette isle merveilleuse, la confiance qu'elle inspire, l'aurait abandonnée."—Mad. de Staël, *Considérations, &c. Œuvres*, t. xiii. p. 98.

[5] "Incendiez les quatre coins de l'Europe, notre salut est là."—Ap. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t v. p. 350.

[6] Michelet, *ibid.* p. 342.

[7] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiv. p. 204.

10th, at Mardyck. But Dumouriez, instead of going to London, as he wished, was directed to attack Holland with all possible speed. Soon after declaring war, the Convention decreed a levy of 500,000 men, and assumed the superintendence of the armies by means of nine commissaries armed with power to remove those who were incapable, to punish those who were indifferent, to annihilate (*foudroyer*) traitors. A progressive income-tax was assessed on the rich, and all Frenchmen between the ages of eighteen and forty, being bachelors or widowers without children, were held in permanent requisition for the war.

Thus was initiated by far the greatest struggle ever witnessed by modern Europe, or, perhaps, by all time; a war that was to last with little intermission more than twenty years, and to be concluded only by the exhaustion of France, and it may almost be said of Europe combined against her. Austria and Prussia had, indeed, commenced the war; but those Powers would speedily have retired from the contest had not Great Britain intervened; and this country must be regarded as the main prop of all the coalitions subsequently formed against France. Both England and France seem to have underrated each other's resources. Brissot concludes the report already referred to with a most depreciatory account, which it is curious to read at the present day, of the resources and population of England, and of the precarious tenure of her colonies, especially India. British statesmen seem also to have undervalued the power of France, and to have concluded that internal anarchy would, before long, compel her to succumb. Pitt was of opinion that the war would be ended in one, or at most, two campaigns. Lord Grenville even thought that the capture of Toulon would be a decisive blow.[1] But the social earthquake which had shaken France to her foundations, and seemed to threaten her with dissolution, was, in fact, the secret of her strength. A French political writer of those times, and a Royalist, observed that the Republic was richer and put forth more resources than all the Sovereigns of the Coalition together.[2]

After the declaration of war Great Britain proceeded to conclude a series of treaties with various Powers, which we shall here record together, though some of them were not made till several months later. A treaty with Hanover, March 4th, 1793, for 15,000 men, augmented by 5,000 in January, 1794.[3] A double

[1] See *Life of Wilberforce*, and *Courts and Cabinets of George III.* ap. Massey, vol. iv. p. 45 note.

[2] Mallet du Pan's *Résumé*, drawn up for Lord Elgin, *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. ii. p. 20.

[3] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 422 (2e Ed.).

treaty with Russia, at London, March 25th, 1793—one commercial, the other directed against France.[1] The ports of both countries were to be shut against France; no provisions were to be exported thither; her commerce was to be molested; neutrals were to be hindered from assisting her. This clause was intended to cut off the commerce of France with her colonies by means of neutral vessels. Notwithstanding this treaty, however, the Empress Catharine took no part in the war upon the Continent, directing all her efforts against Poland, though she sent a fleet into the Baltic and North Sea in August to assist in intercepting the commerce of neutrals with France. A treaty with Sardinia, April 25th. The King of Sardinia to keep on foot an army of 50,000 men during the war, receiving a subsidy of 200,000*l.* sterling per annum. Great Britain to send a fleet into the Mediterranean.[2] A treaty with Spain, May 25th. Both countries to shut their ports against French vessels and to prevent neutral vessels from aiding French commerce.[3] A treaty with the King of the Two Sicilies, July 12th, who was indignant at having been forced to recognize the French Republic. Great Britain undertook to maintain a respectable fleet in the Mediterranean, while the King of the Two Sicilies was to provide 6,000 soldiers, four ships of the line, and four smaller vessels.[4] A treaty between England and Prussia at the camp before Mentz, July 14th, for the most perfect union and confidence in carrying on the war against France,[5] subsequently converted into a treaty of Subsidies. A treaty at London, August 30th, between Great Britain and the Emperor.[6] Portugal also entered into the Coalition by a treaty signed at London, September 26th, by which she undertook to shut her ports against the French during the war, and to prohibit her subjects from carrying warlike stores and provisions to France.[7] Treaties for troops were also concluded with some of the smaller German States. The execution of Louis XVI. had decided the Spanish Government to join the Coalition; the French Ambassador was dismissed, and the Convention unanimously declared war against Spain, March 7th, 1793. Thus, all the Christian Powers except Sweden, Denmark, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Switzerland, Venice, and Genoa, entered successively into the League against France, which remained completely isolated and dependent on her own resources.

The Spanish Court had been disposed to war chiefly by the

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. pp. 433, 439; Garden, t. v. p. 202.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 462.
[3] Garden, t. v. p. 204.
[4] Martens, t. v. p. 480 (2e Ed.).
[5] *Ibid.* p. 483.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 447.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 519.

counsels of Don Emanuel Godoy, and in opposition to the opinion of the Count d'Aranda. Charles IV., who had succeeded his father Charles III. in 1788, and who, as Prince of Asturias, had displayed the most ungovernable violence of temper, manifested after his accession quite a contrary disposition, the result, it is said, of an illness with which he was afflicted. He was destitute neither of intelligence nor education; his heart was good, his judgment sound; but he was of a pusillanimous temper, and of so idle a disposition that anything requiring thought and application became a fatigue. His sole delight was in the chase, and, in order to enjoy it without interruption, he gladly resigned affairs of State into the hands of his Queen, Maria Louisa, daughter of the last Duke of Parma. Unfortunately, Maria Louisa was an artful, violent, and vindictive woman, of dissolute morals, vulgar mind, and imperious temper. She gladly seized the reins of power, though totally unqualified to rule, and she handed them over to a favourite not much better fitted for the task than herself. Don Emanuel Godoy, born at Badajoz in 1767 of a poor but noble family, has, perhaps, in some respects been defamed by the envy which his success could not fail to attract. He seems naturally to have possessed a good understanding and a humane temper; he was well acquainted with mankind, and used his knowledge with tact. But he was so ignorant that he could not even speak his own language correctly, and was deficient in grace and dignity of manner. He owed his advancement to his personal beauty. He attracted the notice of the Queen, and was suddenly advanced from the station of a simple *garde du corps* to manage the affairs of Spain. Charles IV. showed an entire submission to his Queen; Godoy also became his favourite and Prime Minister, and was loaded with favours and distinctions. But this sudden elevation perverted all his natural good qualities. He became idle and avaricious, fond of show, extravagantly ambitious, corrupted, and debauched. Modern history presents few instances of a crowned head and a favourite who have made a more frightful use of their power, or more shamelessly abused a great and generous nation.

CHAPTER LVI.

WHILE the French were thus throwing down the gauntlet to all Europe, their own country seemed sinking into anarchical dissolution. Paris was filled with tumult, insurrection, and robbery. At the denunciations of Marat against "forestallers," the shops were entered by the mob, who carried off articles at their own prices, and sometimes without paying at all. The populace was agitated by the harangues of low itinerant demagogues. Rough and brutal manners were affected, and all the courtesies of life abolished. Moderate persons of no strong political opinions were denounced as "suspected,"[1] and their crime stigmatized by the newly-coined word of *moderantisme*. The variations of popular feeling were recorded like the heat of the weather, or the rising of a flood. The principal articles in the journals were entitled, "Thermometer of the Public Mind;" the Jacobins talked of the necessity of being "up to the level." Many of the provinces were in a disturbed state. A movement had been organizing in Brittany ever since 1791, but the death of the Marquis de la Rouarie, its principal leader, had for the present suspended it. A more formidable insurrection was preparing in La Vendée. Chiefly agricultural, with few roads or large towns, and thus almost isolated from the rest of France, La Vendée had been little infected by the new opinions. It contained a class of haughty gentlemen, warmly attached to their ancient feudal customs and privileges, who had not joined the emigration, and still resided on their estates; while the peasantry were superstitiously devoted to their priests. La Vendée, from its undulating surface, numerous streams, narrow roads, and the cover afforded by hedges and small woods, is well adapted to defensive warfare. On March 10th, 1793, the day appointed for levying men for the war, the insurrection broke out at several points at once, principally under the leadership of Cathelineau, a working man, Stofflet, a gamekeeper, and Athanase Charette, a naval officer styling himself Le Chevalier Charette. They were afterwards joined by Henry de la Roche-

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiv. p. 421.

jaquelein, Bonchamps, De Lescure, D'Elbée, and others; under whose auspices a force was raised of some 40,000 or 50,000 men, in seven divisions of unequal size. In the course of April and May they took Bressuire, Thouars, Parthenay, and other places, and they applied for assistance to England and Spain.

It was in the midst of these disturbances, aggravated by a suspicion of General Dumouriez's treachery, which we shall presently have to relate, that the terrible court known as the REVOLUTIONARY TRIBUNAL was erected. Danton, after his return from Belgium, whither he had been despatched by the Convention to inquire into the state of that country and the conduct of Dumouriez, had become impressed with the necessity of establishing a dictatorship, or some despotic power in France, in order to restore order and enable her to meet the dangers with which she was surrounded. In this view Robespierre participated, who had become disgusted with the proceedings of the Hôtel de Ville, and imagined that he should get on better with the Convention. The Tribunal was first formally proposed in the Convention, March 9th, by Carrier, the miscreant afterwards notorious by his massacres at Nantes, urged by Cambacérès on the 10th, and completed that very night at the instance of Danton, who rushed to the tribune, and insisted that the Assembly should not separate till the new Court had been organized. The Girondists had hoped at least to adjourn the subject; but Danton told them, in his terrible voice, that there was no alternative between the proposed tribunal and the more summary method of popular vengeance. The extraordinary tribunal of August, 1792, had not been found to work fast enough, and it was now superseded by this new one, which became, in fact, only a method of massacring under the form of law. The Revolutionary Tribunal was designed to take cognizance of all counter-revolutionary attempts, of all attacks upon liberty, equality, the unity and indivisibility of the Republic, the internal and external safety of the State. A commission of six members of the Convention was to examine and report upon the cases to be brought before it, to draw up and present the acts of accusation. The tribunal was to be composed of a jury to decide upon the facts, five judges to apply the law, a public accuser, and two substitutes; from its sentence there was no appeal.[1]

Meanwhile Dumouriez had returned to the army, very dissatisfied that he had failed in his attempts to save the King and baffle the Jacobins. He had formed the design of invading Holland,

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv. p. 59 sq.; Cf. Croker, *Essays, &c.* p. 445.

dissolving the Revolutionary Committee in that country, annulling the decree of December 15th, offering neutrality to the English, a suspension of arms to the Austrians, reuniting the Belgian and Batavian Republics, and proposing to France a reunion with them. In case of refusal, he designed to march upon Paris, dissolve the Convention, extinguish Jacobinism; in short, to play the part of Monk in England.[1] This plan was confided to four persons only, among whom Danton is said to have been one; it is, at all events, certain that he supported Dumouriez at this time, as appears from his praises of him in the Convention.[2]

Dumouriez, having directed General Miranda to lay siege to Maestricht, left Antwerp for Holland, February 22nd, and by March 4th had seized Breda, Klundert, and Gertruydenberg. England had despatched 2,000 guards to the aid of the Dutch, and at her instance Austria had pushed forward 112,000 men under Prince Josias of Saxe-Coburg. Clairfait, with his army, at this time occupied Bergheim, where he was separated from the French only by the little river Roer and the fortress of Jülich. Coburg, having joined Clairfait, March 1st, crossed the Roer, defeated the French under Dampierre at Altenhoven, and thus compelled Miranda to raise the siege of Maestricht, and retire towards Tongres. Aix-la-Chapelle was entered by the Austrians after a smart contest, and the French compelled to retreat upon Liége, while the divisions under Stengel and Neuilly, being cut off by this movement, were thrown back into Limburg. Large bodies of the French made for the frontier in disorderly flight. The Austrians then crossed the Meuse, took Liége, March 6th, and following up their success, arrived within two days' march of Brussels. The Flemings, disgusted by the brutalities and extortions of the Jacobin Commissioners, and encouraged by the presence of the Austrians, rose against the French. Dumouriez, who was on the point of crossing the frith called Hollands Diep, at the mouth of the Meuse, was directed to return into Belgium, to arrest the progress of the Austrians. His first acts on arriving there were to abrogate all the doings of the Commissioners, to shut up the Jacobin clubs, and order the restoration of all stolen property. He concentrated his forces, about 50,000 men, at Louvain. From this place he wrote a threatening letter to the Convention, March 11th, denouncing the proceedings of the Ministry, the acts of oppression committed in Belgium, and the

[1] See *Mém.* de Dumouriez, t. iv. liv. viii. ch. i.

[2] Sitting of March 10th, *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv.

Decree of December 15.[1] This letter threw the Committee of General Defence into consternation. It was resolved to keep it secret, and Danton and Lacroix set off for Dumouriez's camp, to try what they could do with him, but found him inflexible.

Dumouriez routed the Austrians at Tirlemont, March 16th, but was defeated by Prince Coburg at Neerwinden, on the 18th, where the battle was decided by a charge of the Archduke Charles, which routed the French. In an interview with the Austrian Colonel Mack, at Ath, he announced to that officer his intention to march on Paris, establish a Constitutional Monarchy, and proclaim the Dauphin. The Duke de Chartres (Louis Philippe) was present at this conference. The Austrians were to support Dumouriez's advance upon Paris, but not to show themselves except in case of need, and he was to have the command of what Austrian troops he might select.[2] The French now continued their retreat, which, in consequence of these negotiations, was unmolested. The Archduke Charles and Prince Coburg entered Brussels March 25th, and the Dutch towns were shortly after retaken.

When Dumouriez arrived with his van at Courtrai, he was met by three emissaries of the Jacobins, sent apparently to sound him. He bluntly told them that his design was to save France, whether they called him Cæsar, Cromwell, or Monk, denounced the Convention as an assembly of tyrants, and said that he despised their decrees. All this the emissaries reported to the Convention on their return. At St. Amand he was met by Beurnonville, then Minister of War, who was to supersede him in the command, and by four commissaries despatched by the Convention. Camus, one of these, presented to him, in the midst of his officers, a decree summoning him to the bar of the Convention. After an angry altercation, in which Dumouriez declared that he would not submit himself to the Revolutionary Tribunal so long as he had an inch of steel at his side, Camus boldly pronounced him suspended from his functions, whereupon Dumouriez called in some hussars, and arrested the commissaries and Beurnonville, who were handed over to Clairfait, and ultimately carried to Maestricht.[3]

The allies were so sanguine that Dumouriez's defection would put an end to the Revolution, that Lord Auckland and Count

[1] *Supra*, p. 425. The Decree is in the Appendix to Dumouriez's *Mémoires*, t. iii. note D.

[2] Dumouriez, *Mém.* t. iv. liv. viii. ch. viii.

[3] See the account of Camus, in Toulongeon, t. v. App.; Dumouriez, *Mémoires*, t. iv. liv. viii. ch. xii.; *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 223.

Stahremberg, the Austrian Minister, looking upon the dissolution and flight of the Convention as certain, addressed a joint note to the States-General, requesting them not to shelter such members of it as had taken any part in the condemnation of Louis XVI.[1] But Dumouriez's army was not with him. On the road to Condé he was fired on by a body of volunteers and compelled to fly for his life (April 4th). In the evening he joined Colonel Mack, when they employed themselves in drawing up a proclamation in the name of Prince Coburg, which was published on the following day. Dumouriez ventured once more to show himself to his army, but was received with such visible marks of dissatisfaction, that he was compelled to return to the Austrian quarters at Tournai with a few companions, among whom was the Duke de Chartres. Thus terminated Dumouriez's political and military career.

The situation of France at this time seemed almost desperate. The army of the North was completely disorganized through the defection of Dumouriez; the armies of the Rhine and Mosello were retreating; those of the Alps and Italy were expecting an attack; on the eastern end of the Pyrenees the troops were without artillery, without generals, almost without bread, while on the western side the Spaniards were advancing towards Bayonne. Brest, Cherbourg, the coasts of Brittany, were threatened by the English. The ocean ports contained only six ships of the line ready for sea, and the Mediterranean fleet was being repaired at Toulon.[2] But the energy of the revolutionary leaders was equal to the occasion. The Convention seized the direction of military affairs, and despatched eight commissaries, among them Carnot, not only to superintend the operations of the army, but also to keep it under the surveillance of the Assembly. Dumouriez was declared a traitor, a price was set upon his head, and General Dampierre was appointed to his vacant place. In compliance with a petition of the *Commune*, it was voted that a camp of 40,000 men should be formed under the walls of Paris.

But the most important measure suggested by the present posture of affairs was the establishment, at the instance of Barère, of the *Comité de Salut Public*, or *Committee of Public Welfare*,[3]

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 27 sqq.

[2] L. Blanc, t. viii. p. 318.

[3] This Committee is generally called by English writers the *Committee of Public Safety*, sometimes the *Committee of Public Salvation*. But the word *Wohlfahrt* (welfare), by which *salut* is rendered by German writers, seems nearer to its true meaning, and discriminates better the functions of the two Committees. To watch over the public *safety* or *security* (*sûreté*) was the object of the older Committee.

April 6th, 1793. There already existed a *Comité de Sûreté Générale* (or Committee of General Safety), established October 2nd, 1792, but this was rather a board of police than a political body. The new Committee was to be composed of nine Members of the Convention, who were to deliberate in secret, to watch over and accelerate the deliberation of the Ministry, and to control the measures of the Executive Council. Thus it was in fact little short of a dictatorship of nine persons; though, by way of check upon them, they were to have no power over the national treasury, were to be renewed every month, and were to render to the Convention every week an account of their proceedings, and of the situation of the Republic.[1] The Girondists did not oppose the erection of this Committee. Nearly half its first members were indeed taken from the centre or the right of the Convention; the rest from the more moderate section of the Mountain, including, however, the terrible Danton. Robespierre and the more violent Jacobins were not yet admitted; an exclusion which they resented by agitating and getting up inflammatory petitions.[2] After this period, the Committee of General Safety was charged with the administration of the police, became in fact a sort of executive power, while the functions of the new Committee were higher and more general, and indeed essentially functions of government. Nevertheless, the Committee of General Safety recognized no authority superior to its own, except the decrees of the Convention, till after the fall of the Girondists; when the Committee of Public Welfare, instead of consulting, began to dictate to it.[3]

By the creation of the Revolutionary Tribunal and of the Committee of Public Welfare, all the instruments of the Reign of Terror had been provided; but Robespierre and the men who were to wield them were still in the background. The deadly struggle for place and power between the Gironde and the Mountain was, however, in progress. The Convention was the daily scene of the denunciations and quarrels of the two parties, which sometimes rose to such a pitch of violence that swords were drawn and the lives of the members threatened. The inviolability of the deputies had been abolished by a decree of April 1st, by which the two parties voted their right to proscribe one another. The populace was incited to agitate against the Girondists. On the 8th of April, a deputation from the Section Bon Conseil

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv. p. 301.
[2] Michelet, t. v. p. 460 sq.
[3] Montgaillard, *Hist. de France, &c.* t. iv. p. 25.

declared in the Convention that the public voice condemned Gaudet, Gensonné, Brissot, Barbaroux, Louvet, Buzot, and other members of that party. On the same day the Convention had decreed that all the members of the Bourbon family, including Philippe Egalité, should be detained at Marseille.[1] On the 15th of April a deputation from thirty-five of the forty-eight Sections, headed by Pache, now Mayor of Paris, presented to the Convention a petition demanding in the most violent language the expulsion of twenty-two of the leading Girondists; and when Fonfrède suggested an appeal to the sovereign people of France, in their primary assemblies, the *Commune*, by a fresh deputation, intimated that the Sections did not contemplate any such appeal, but required the punishment of the traitors—that is, in other words, the execution of a judgment not pronounced.[2] The Girondists did not venture to persist in their demand for an appeal, though they had a majority in the Assembly, and contented themselves with decreeing that the National Convention reprobated as calumnious the petition presented by the thirty-five Sections, and adopted by the Council General of the *Commune;* and with directing that this decree should be forwarded to the different departments.[3] But they procured a decree for the arraignment of Marat before the Revolutionary Tribunal for having signed an incendiary address as president of the Jacobin Club. This most impolitic act resulted, as might have been foreseen, only in the triumph of Marat and the Jacobins, from which faction the jury of that tribunal were selected, and most of whose members were friends of Robespierre. Some of these jurymen were so ignorant that they could neither read nor write, others were habitually intoxicated.[4] The new tribunal had not yet done much business, though it had perpetrated some most absurd and cruel acts, such as sending a poor kitchen-maid to the guillotine for having cried *Vive le Roi!* when drunk. When Marat surrendered himself prisoner he was treated with the most delicate attentions. He did not even pretend to defend himself; on the contrary, he assumed the part of accuser instead of defendant, boasted of what he had done, and laid all the blame on the Girondists. He was of course immediately acquitted (April 24th). On his release the mob almost stifled him with kindness, crowned him with laurel, bore him on their shoulders to the hall of the

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv. pp. 302, 310 sqq.
[2] *Ibid.* t. xxvi. pp. 3 and 16; Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* liv. x. ch. vii.
[3] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxi. p. 84.
[4] *Procès Fouquier Tinville*, ap. Croker, *Essays, &c.* p. 436.

Convention, through which they defiled amidst the cheers of the galleries and the ill-concealed fear of the deputies. At the Jacobins that evening Marat congratulated himself that he had put a rope round the necks of the Girondists.[1]

At this time Danton would willingly have effected a reconciliation with the Gironde. He prepared a grand banquet in the Park of Sceaux, to which the leaders of that party were invited; champagne flowed in abundance, and the presence of many Parisian courtesans lent excitement to the feast. But when, after dinner, Danton proposed an amnesty for the past, Guadet, though with silent disapprobation of Vergniaud, replied with an unconditional refusal. The Girondists had now proclaimed themselves the advocates of security and order, and could not with any consistency ally themselves with Danton, the patron of the Septembrists, and still the advocate of violence. Danton ascribed their rejection of him to personal hatred, and for his own safety threw in his lot with the Mountain, though he had repented of his former courses, and even after the banquet publicly voted with the Gironde on the question whether the Government should be named by the people or by the legislative body. It is also said that in a nocturnal conference at Charenton with Pache, Robespierre, Henriot, and others, he opposed a massacre of the Girondists, and preferred to extort a decree against them by threats and intimidation.[2] The Gironde made some feeble attempts to oppose the *Commune* and the Jacobins with their own weapons. The *Commune*, by a Decree of May 1st, had ordered a levy to be made in Paris of 12,000 men for the war in La Vendée, and had laid a heavy income-tax upon the rich. These measures excited great discontent among the clerks, apprentices, and other young men of the better classes subject to the conscription; riots ensued, which were stimulated by the *Gironde* and by articles in Brissot's *Patriote*. But such partisans were no match for a mob of *sans-culottes*, a regular army of whom was taken into pay at the instance of Robespierre.[3] On the 2nd of May the Convention was compelled by the threats of the Hôtel de Ville to place a *maximum* on the price of corn. The Girondists, after a vain attempt to remodel the Municipality, obtained, on the motion of Barère, the appointment of a *Commission of Twelve*, armed with extraordinary power, and selected from their own party (May 18th).[4] This step tended to bring matters to an issue between the contending factions.

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxi. p. 144.
[2] Von Sybel, iii. p. 70 sq. (Eng. Trans.).
[3] Michelet, t. v. p. 515.
[4] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 132.

The *Twelve* forbade nocturnal assemblies of the Sections, dismissed Boulanger from the command of the National Guard, and by ordering the arrest of two administrators of police charged with provoking massacre, of a low demagogue named Varlet, and of Hébert, substitute of the *Procureur de la Commune*, and editor of the infamous journal called *Père Duchesne*, who in a calumnious article had threatened the Girondists with the *guillotine*, provoked a trial of strength between the parties. A deputation from the *Commune* appeared at the bar of the Convention, May 25th, to demand that Hébert, "a magistrate estimable for his virtues and enlightenment," should be restored to his functions. Amidst the clamour which ensued, the Girondist Isnard, then president of the Assembly, in an angry and foolish speech, declared that France had confided the national representatives to Paris, and if they were attacked, he threatened in the name of all France that Paris should be annihilated, that the spot which it had occupied should soon be sought in vain.[1] The clamour with which this address was greeted may be imagined.

The Girondists had unquestionably a majority in the provinces, though the Commissioners of the Convention had done their best to spread terror through the length and breadth of the land. Vast numbers were arrested and imprisoned in some of the principal towns, without either charge or examination. At Sedan the Commissioner declared that *sans-culottes* were the only citizens; Chabot, at Toulouse, told the people that they wanted no priests, that the citizen, Christ, was the first *Sans-culotte*.[2] It was only a few of the larger municipalities, as Bordeaux and Rouen, that were able to defend themselves against these outrages. The walls of Bordeaux had been covered with placards threatening to revenge its deputies, if killed; the party of Barbaroux, at Marseille, had manifested anti-revolutionary sentiments, and Girondist addresses had been presented from that town, as well as from Bordeaux, Lyon, Avignon, Nantes, and other places.[3] But there was no hope of deriving material aid from the provinces; the fate of France was to be decided at Paris, and here the Girondists could reckon only on three of the forty-eight Sections, the Butte-des-Moulins, Quatre-vingt-douze, and Du Mail. Robespierre, who had been gradually organizing the means of overthrowing the Gironde, observed in the Jacobin Club, May 26th: "The Faubourg St. Antoine will crush the

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 224 sqq. [2] Von Sybel, iii. p. 59.
[3] *Hist. Parl. ibid.* pp. 91, 153, 197, &c.

Section du Mail. Generally speaking, the people should repose on their strength; but when all laws are violated, when despotism is at its height, they ought to rise. *This moment is come.* For my own part, I declare that I place myself in insurrection against the President and all the members of the Convention."[1] Some stormy scenes ensued in that Assembly, and the decreasing majority in favour of the Gironde showed that the *Marais* was going over to the *Mountain*. The Convention, menaced by a deputation, voted the release of Hébert and the other prisoners.

The insurrection which overthrew the Girondists was organized by commissaries from thirty-six of the Sections, who met at the *Evêché*. They were about 500 in number, including 100 women, and assumed the name of the *Central Club*. The destruction of the *Gironde* was resolved on at a meeting of this Assembly, May 29th; Robespierre, with his usual craft, withdrew as the moment of action approached. He observed that day at the Jacobin Club: "I cannot prescribe to the people the means by which it must save itself. I am exhausted by four years of revolution, and by the heartrending spectacle of the triumph of tyranny. It is not for me to indicate the course of action. I am consumed by a slow fever—the fever of patriotism. I have spoken: I have no further duty to accomplish at this time."[2] But he had remarked that if the *Commune* did not join the people, it would violate its first duty.

Early in the morning of May 31st the Central Club, having previously declared the *Commune* and the Department in a state of insurrection, sent Commissaries to the Hôtel de Ville to declare that the people of Paris annulled the constituted Municipal authorities; and they exhibited the unlimited powers which they had received from thirty-three Sections to save the Republic. Upon this the Municipal officers and General Council abdicated, but were immediately reinstated in their functions. The latter now assumed the title of *Revolutionary* Council General; an epithet which signified that all the usual laws and observances were suspended. Henriot, a brutal ruffian who had been a gentleman's servant, and afterwards a clerk at the barriers, was named Provisional Commander-General of the Parisian forces.[3] An act of impeachment against the Girondists was drawn up; every proletary was offered a day's wages of forty sous, and the tocsin

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 243 sqq. [2] *Ibid.* p. 279 sq.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 306 sqq.

was sounded in every quarter. In order to give the movement an appearance of order, and to convert it into what was called "a *moral* insurrection," the Jacobins had convened a meeting of deputies from the forty-eight Sections and representatives of the authorities of the Department, who elected a commission of eleven, to be incorporated with the Council General of the *Commune*. These men pretended to restrain any open violence. But the Girondists were soon undeceived by the appearance of petitioners, violently demanding that the price of bread should be fixed at three livres, that workshops should be established to make arms for the *sans-culottes*, that Commissaries should be sent to Marseille and other southern towns, that the Ministers Le Brun and Clavière should be arrested, that the obnoxious twenty-two members, as well as the twelve, should be arrested. Soon after arrived the members of the administration of the Department, the authorities of the *Commune*, and the Commissaries of the Sections, accompanied by a crowd of savages armed with clubs, pikes, and other weapons. L'Huillier, the *procureur Général Syndic*, their spokesman, denounced by name several of the leading Girondists, stigmatized the crime they had been guilty of in threatening to destroy Paris, the centre of the arts and sciences, the cradle of liberty. The populace now spread themselves in the Assembly, and fraternized with the *Mountain*. In this scene of indescribable confusion, Robespierre, adopting the vulgar prejudices of the day, demanded the accusation of "the accomplices of Dumouriez," and of all those named by the petitioners. Vergniaud, the orator of the Gironde, was too terrified to reply; in his alarm, he had himself moved that the address of the previous petitioners should be printed and circulated in the Departments! The debate was closed by the adoption of a decree proposed by Barère: "That the armed force of the Department of Paris should be in permanent requisition till further orders; that the Committee of Public Welfare, in concert with the constitutional authorities, should investigate the plots denounced at the bar; that the Twelve should be suppressed; that a proclamation explaining these proceedings should be forwarded to all the Departments" (May 31st.)[1]

These measures, and especially the establishment of a permanent insurrectionary force with regular pay, convinced the Girondists that their power was at an end. Their discouragement was completed by the news that the men of the three Sections on

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 350 sq.

which they relied, had fraternized with those of the Faubourg St. Antoine. Some now proposed to fly into the provinces and raise an insurrection, but this was negatived by the majority. On the following day they absented themselves from the Convention. When that body assembled, June 2nd, it was surrounded by 80,000 armed men, with 163 guns. Among them were the 12,000 men destined for La Vendée, who had been purposely detained at Courbevoie. A scene of indescribable tumult and violence ensued. Hoping to overawe the people by the majesty of the National Assembly, Hérault de Séchelles, who that day presided, descended with the greater part of the members among the crowd, he himself with his hat on, the rest uncovered. Addressing Henriot, who with his staff was stationed in the court leading to the Carrousel,[1] he asked what the people wanted? remarked that the Convention was occupied only with promoting its happiness. "The people," replied Henriot, pressing his hat over his brow with one hand, and drawing his sword with the other, "has not come here to listen to phrases, but to give orders. What it wants is thirty-four criminals." Then, reining back his horse, he shouted in a voice of thunder, "Cannoniers to your guns!" The members of the Convention, after attempting a retreat through the gardens, from which they were driven by Marat and his myrmidons, were compelled to resume their sitting in profound dejection.

The *Commune* and the Jacobins were now victorious. It was a repetition of the 10th August for the Gironde. On the motion of Couthon a list of the deputies to be proscribed was read in the Convention; Marat added to or retrenched from it as he pleased.[2] A decree was passed for the arrest of twenty-one of the leading Girondists, including Vergniaud, Brissot, Gensonné, Guadet, Gorsas, Pétion, Barbaroux, Buzot, Rabaud St. Etienne, Lasource, Lanjuinais, Louvet, and others; also of the Ministers, Clavière and Le Brun, and of the whole Commission of Twelve, except Fonfrède and St. Martin—in all, thirty-three persons.[3] Isnard and Fouchet, having resigned their functions, were not arrested, but were forbidden to leave Paris. The proscribed Girondists were merely placed under the surveillance of *gendarmes*, from which most of them contrived to escape, and fled to the Departments of the Eure and the Calvados, to Lyon, Nîmes,

[1] The Convention had transferred their sittings from the *Manège* to the Tuileries, May 10th.

[2] *Mém. de Meillan*, ap. Blanc, *Révol. Fr.* t. viii. p. 468.

[3] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 401.

Moulins, and other places. Vergniaud, Valazé, and Gensonné remained in custody. Seventy-three deputies, who subsequently signed a protest against the arrest of the Girondists, were expelled from the Convention and imprisoned.[1]

Thus the *Gironde* fell by the same power it had itself employed to overwhelm the nobles, proscribe the priests, and sap the throne—the power of the Parisian mob. They had relied too much on their oratory and their journals, were vain enough to imagine that they could control the spirit which they had conjured up, and complacently assumed the name of *hommes d'état* or statesmen. They were indeed, by the admission of Danton himself, vastly superior to the *Montagne* in talents and education; "but," he added, "we have more audacity than they, and the *canaille* is at our command."[2] Such, no doubt, was the true state of the case. The Girondists had lost all influence with the mob, and it was not till too late that they attempted to find a counterpoise in the provinces. A strong reactionary spirit existed in many parts of France, which required only leading, and the arrest of the Girondists was followed by some serious insurrections. At Caen an association, calling itself the "Central Assembly of resistance to oppression," published a violent manifest against the Jacobins of Paris. Two commissaries, Prieur and Romme, whom the Convention had despatched into the Calvados, were arrested and confined in the Castle of Caen. Felix Wimpfen, a brave soldier, who headed the insurrection in this quarter, failed, however, in the attempt to raise an army, and the Girondists, who had fled to the Calvados, now made their way to Quimper and embarked for Bordeaux. The authorities of this city had declared themselves in a state of provisional independence under the title of "Popular Commission of Public Safety." At Rennes the primary assemblies voted a violent address to the Convention. At Lyon, when news arrived of the insurrection in the Calvados, the citizens openly raised the standard of revolt, fortified the town, levied an army of 20,000 men, and opened communications with the emigrants and the King of Sardinia. Disturbances had broken out in this city before the end of May. The Girondists, united with the royalists, had had some serious rencounters with the republican party, led by Chalier, a member of the Municipality; the banner of the Gironde proved victorious, and Chalier was seized and executed July 16th. An army of

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 148.

[2] Prudhomme, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 287.

counter-revolutionists, formed at Marseille, and increased by battalions from Aix, Nîmes, Montauban, Toulouse, and other places, marched towards Lyon, took possession of Avignon, Arles, and both banks of the Rhone; Carteaux, at the head of a small force, was the only obstacle to their junction with the Lyonese. Even at Paris a reactionary spirit was displayed in several of the Sections.

The death of Marat was another result of the fall of the Girondists. In the neighbourhood of Caen, whither many of them had fled, lived Charlotte Corday, a descendant, it is said, of a sister of the great Corneille. She was then about twenty-five years of age, having been born at St. Saturnin near Seéz, in July, 1768. A partisan of the Gironde, and enraged by its fall, she proceeded to Paris; obtained admission to Marat on pretence of giving him some valuable information on the state of the Calvados; found him in a bath, and plunged a knife into his breast with so determined a thrust that he expired in a few minutes (July 13th, 1793). She attempted not to escape, and being condemned to death by the Revolutionary Tribunal, met her fate with serenity and courage. It was a just retribution that the apostle of massacre and murder should fall by the dagger of an assassin; but his death only enhanced his popularity and inaugurated his apotheosis. The blasphemous honours paid to the memory of so vile a wretch show the depravity and degradation to which a great part of the French had sunk. His heart, deposited in an agate vase, one of the most precious spoils of the *Garde Meuble*, was exposed on an altar erected in the Luxembourg, amidst flowers and the smoke of incense, to the adoration of the Parisians, who sang litanies in its honour, in which it was compared with the heart of the Saviour![1] A sort of pyramid was also erected to his memory on the Carrousel, in the interior of which were placed his bust, bath, inkstand, and lamp. In November his remains were carried to the Pantheon in place of those of Mirabeau, which were ejected.

Amidst these dangers and alarms the new Constitution, drawn up from the ideas of Condorcet but modified by Robespierre, was decreed by the Convention, June 23rd, with a listlessness and apathy betraying their appreciation of its efficacy. It is unnecessary to describe the "Constitution of '93," or of An I, since it was

[1] "O cor Jésus—O cor Marat—Cœur sacré de Jésus—cœur sacré de Marat—vous avez les mêmes droits à nos hommages!"—Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 439. The Cordeliers subsequently obtained possession of the heart, and suspended it from their roof. Here also it was addressed in prayer. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 395.

soon virtually suspended by the dictatorial authority assumed by the Committee of Public Welfare. It was based on the principles current at that time of the sovereignty of the people, universal suffrage, liberty, equality, the fraternity of all mankind, &c.[1] Condorcet attacked it in a pamphlet, complained that his own ideas had been spoilt, that the new Constitution had been drawn up and passed with indecent haste at a time when the liberty of the national representatives had been grossly outraged, and passed a glowing eulogium on the proscribed Girondists; for uttering which sentiments in this free Republic he was denounced in the Convention by Chabot, July 8th, and a decree was issued for his arrest.[2] The widow of Louis François Vernet sheltered him a while in her house; but he was at length driven to commit suicide in order to avoid the *guillotine*. The new Constitution was also opposed by the extreme democratic party called the *enragés*, led by Varlet, Leclerc, Jacques Roux, an unfrocked priest, and other low demagogues. This faction attacked even the Mountain; but their chief objects were tumult and plunder. They got up a riot which lasted three days, during which, under the usual pretext of forestallers, they seized cargoes of soap and other articles, which they paid for at their own prices.[3]

It was fortunate for France during this domestic anarchy that the allies combined against her, divided by their own selfish views and jealousies, had no well-concerted plan of action. After the flight of Dumouriez, General Dampierre, his successor, had collected the scattered remnants of the French army in a camp at Famars; and he proceeded to form entrenched camps at Cassel, Lille, Maubeuge, Charleroi, and Givet. The Imperial army under Prince Coburg entered the French territory, April 9th, but the movements of that commander were as slow and indecisive as those of the Duke of Brunswick had been; and though Lille, Condé, Valenciennes, and Maubeuge were threatened, nothing of importance was done. Coburg was of opinion that the strife of parties would reduce France to a state of impotence, and that about the spring of 1794 an invasion might be securely undertaken. Hence he had already determined in April to attempt nothing further in the ensuing campaign of 1793 than the reduction of some frontier fortresses.[4] The Duke of York, with 10,000 English, having disembarked at Ostend, April 20th, proceeded to

[1] There is a brief analysis of it in Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 48 sq.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 271.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 216 sq.
[4] Mallet du Pan, *Mémoire* for Lord Elgin, *Mém. et Corr.* t. i. p. 408; *Oestr. milit. Zeitschrift*, 1813, ap. Von Sybel, B. ii. S. 391.

join the Dutch and Hanoverian divisions. Their united cantonments extended from Tournai and Courtrai to the sea. In vain the Duke of York and the Austrian general, Clairfait, urged an advance; Coburg would not stir. His views respecting the campaign were, no doubt, a good deal influenced by the Austrian policy at this time, which was to secure the reconquered Belgian provinces; the states of which were restored to their former rights, and the Archduke Charles was appointed Governor-General of the Austrian Netherlands. Attacks were made by the French with the view of saving Condé; against the better judgment of Dampierre, who saw their inutility, but was urged to them by the Convention. In one of these, May 8th, he sought and found his death in preference to the alternative of the *guillotine*. At length the allies attacked the French at Famars, and drove them from their camp, May 23rd. The victory was won by the Duke of York turning the French flank; Coburg had wasted his time in useless manœuvres.[1] A twelve days' march might now have brought the allies to Paris; but Coburg would not leave the frontier towns behind him. The French army, in a state of disorganization, had retreated under the walls of Bouchain.

On the death of Dampierre, Custine, commander of the army of the Rhine, was appointed to his post. Before Custine's departure, Frederick William, soon after the battle of Neerwinden, had crossed the Rhine at Bacharach, dispersed some republican battalions, intercepted Custine's communications between Mentz and Worms, and compelled him to retreat behind the Lauter. Custine was joined here by the army of the Moselle; but though he had 60,000 men against 40,000 Prussians, he ventured not to attack them. The Prussians, on their side, though reinforced by an Austrian corps under Wurmser, and by the emigrants under Condé, confined their whole attention to the reduction of Mentz. Custine, before proceeding to take the command of the army of the North, made a feeble and unsuccessful effort to relieve that place (May 17th). He was succeeded in the command of the army of the Rhine by Houchard, and in that of the army of the Moselle by Alexander Beauharnais, husband of the celebrated Josephine. The allies did not act cordially together. Austria was jealous of Prussia's designs on Poland, and had counter schemes of aggrandizement of her own: of an exchange of territory with Bavaria, of seizing Alsace, of occupying, in her own name, the French frontier fortresses. Great Britain was more intent on acquiring

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 285.

Dunkirk, and seizing the French possessions in the East Indies, than on pushing the continental war with vigour; Prussia had little to gain in the struggle; disliked the Austrian schemes, and wished to husband her forces, in case they should be wanted in Poland; but it was important for her to drive the French from Mentz, the key of Germany. Hence the mighty preparations of the allies for the campaign of 1793 were chiefly employed in the reduction of two towns, Mentz and Valenciennes! The former place capitulated to the Prussians, July 22nd. Condé had surrendered to the Austrians, July 12th; and on the 28th, Valenciennes also capitulated. The garrisons of Mentz and Valenciennes, amounting to upwards of 20,000 men, were dismissed, on condition of not bearing arms against the allies for a year; but this did not prevent the French from employing them with great effect against the Vendéans.[1] Custine, suspected of collusion with the enemy, had been summoned to Paris on the motion of Bazire, before the surrender of Mentz.[2] Kilmaine, his successor, withdrew the army of the North from Cæsar's camp before Bouchain, and established it with little molestation in a strong position behind the Scarpe, between Douai and Arras (August 10th).

While such was the posture of affairs on the northern frontier, a Spanish army under Don Ricardos had entered France on the eastern side of the Pyrenees, had laid siege to Perpignan, captured St. Laurent and the fort of Bellegarde. The Spaniards had also been successful on the western side of that chain, and menaced St. Jean Pié de Port. The Corsicans had risen in insurrection towards the end of May, at the instigation of Pascal Paoli, who was named Generalissimo or Governor of the Island. The clergy reinstated, the emigrants recalled, the emissaries of the French Republic proscribed, and Corsica thrown into the hands of the English—such was the programme of the insurgents. Some slight successes in Piedmont were all that the French could set off against these reverses.

The vigour of the Revolutionary Government seemed to increase as danger became wider and more imminent. On the 10th of July the powers of the Committee of Public Welfare expired, and a new election was held. Barère was re-elected; Danton did not obtain a single vote, but he was in some degree represented by his friends Hérault de Séchelles and Thuriot. St. Just,

[1] Montgaillard. t. iv. pp. 61, 64.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 392. Robespierre had remarked at the Jacobin Club, June 12th, that it was necessary to strike at the generals. *Ibid.* p. 196.

Couthon, and Robert Lindet retained their places; the remaining three, Gasparin, Prieur, and Jean Bon St. André, were Jacobins of the deepest dye. Couthon and St. Just obtained the admission of Robespierre, on the retirement of Gasparin, July 27th, but it was not till the spring of the following year that he attained to supreme authority. Thus was inaugurated the tyranny of absolute and uncontrolled democracy. The number of the Committee was raised to twelve, on the motion of Danton, September 6th; when Billaud Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, and Granet were admitted. The members now divided themselves into smaller committees. Barère and Hérault de Séchelles assumed the Department of Foreign Affairs; Billaud Varennes and Collot d'Herbois that of the Interior; Robespierre and St. Just, that of Legislation. The Ministers waited every evening on the Committee for instructions.[1]

The fresh organization of the Committee was soon testified by its measures. On the 1st of August it was decreed that Marie Antoinette, whose son, to her bitter anguish, was now taken from her, should be transferred to the Conciergerie and arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal; that the expenses of her children should be reduced to those necessary for two private individuals; that all the Capets should be banished, but Elizabeth not till after the judgment of Marie Antoinette; that the Royal tombs and mausoleums at St. Denis and elsewhere should be destroyed on August 10th; that the expenses and equipages of general officers should be reduced to what was strictly necessary; that only patriotic expressions, or the names of ancient Republicans and martyrs of liberty, should henceforth be employed as watchwords; that all foreigners belonging to countries at war with France, not domiciliated previously to July 14th, 1789, should be arrested, and their papers seized; that the barriers of Paris should be closed, and nobody suffered to pass unless charged with a public mission; that a camp should be formed between Paris and the army of the North; that all Frenchmen refusing to receive *assignats* should be subject to a fine of 300 livres, and on a second offence of double that sum, with twenty years of imprisonment in irons.[2]

The decree against foreigners seems to have been suggested by the finding, as it was asserted, of some papers on the person of an

[1] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 606.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. pp. 396-400. M. Blanc, t. ix. 194, gives these decrees imperfectly.

Englishman arrested at Lille, which were said to implicate Mr. Pitt in a vast conspiracy to burn several of the French arsenals, to forestall articles of the first necessity, to depress the value of *assignats*, &c.[1] The papers are manifest forgeries, nor was the Englishman on whom they were said to have been found ever produced and examined. Granier, however, proposed in consequence in the Convention, August 7th, that Pitt was the enemy of the human race, and that everybody was justified in assassinating him. At the instance of Couthon, the latter clause was omitted, but the Convention solemnly decreed the former.[2]

On the 10th of August, the anniversary of the capture of the Tuileries, the establishment of the new Constitution was celebrated by a grand public melodramatic *fête*, arranged by the painter David. The Convention having discharged the principal function for which it was elected, ought now to have given place to another Assembly. But this would also have involved the dissolution of the Committee of Public Welfare; and neither the Convention nor the Committee was inclined to relinquish its hold on power. Danton had proposed to make the Committee a provisional Government, to grant it fifty million livres; but the Committee found it prudent to accept only the grant. Its establishment had raised a party against it called *Hébertistes*, from Hébert, one of its principal members, who was supported by Chaumette, Vincent, and Ronsin. These men were embittered by seeing Robespierre, with whom they had formerly acted, in possession of supreme power, whilst they themselves were excluded. A few days after the *fête* it was decreed that, till the enemy was expelled from France, all Frenchmen were in permanent requisition for the armies. Bachelors were to enlist, married men were to forge arms and transport provisions; women were to make tents, clothing, &c.; children were to scrape lint; old men were to excite the warriors by preaching in public places hatred of Kings and the unity of the Republic.[3] France became one vast camp. To stimulate the Republicanism of the people, it was proposed to publish, under the title of *Annales du Civisme*, the most striking instances of patriotic devotion. The Committee of Public Welfare also directed that such tragedies as *Brutus*, *William Tell*, *Caius Gracchus*, &c., should be performed thrice a week, once at the public expense.[4]

[1] See the papers, *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 383 sqq.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 413. [3] *Ibid.* p. 469. [4] *Ibid.* t. xxix. p. 6 sq.

The generals, as well as the Girondists, were made to feel the power of the new Committee. Biron, commander of the army of La Vendée, was summoned to Paris to give an account of his conduct. Rossignol, his successor, was intrusted to perpetrate every sort of enormity. "In two months, said Barère, La Vendée will cease to exist."[1] Custine, on his arrival in Paris, had been arrested, and conveyed to the Abbaye. On the fall of Valenciennes, he was condemned by the Revolutionary Tribunal, and guillotined August 28th. Robespierre urged on his death, and complained of the dilatoriness of the Revolutionary Tribunal, which he said had "hampered itself with lawyer-like forms," and proposed that it should be reformed. At this time Robespierre first became President of the Convention. On September 5th a decree was passed dividing the "Extraordinary Criminal Tribunal" into four sections, all acting simultaneously and with equal power; increasing the number of judges to sixteen, including the President and Vice-President, the number of the jury to sixty, and the substitutes of the public accusers to five.[2] Chaumette proposed a revolutionary army to traverse the Departments, accompanied by the *guillotine;* and suggested that the gardens of the Tuileries should be used for plants serviceable in the hospitals. Danton, like Robespierre, complained of the slowness of the Revolutionary Tribunal—the head of an aristocrat should fall every day! He also procured two decrees: 1. That there should be an extraordinary assembly of the Sections every Sunday and Thursday, and that each citizen attending them should receive, if he wished it, forty sous; 2. That one hundred millions should be placed at the disposal of the Ministry to fabricate arms. These decrees were voted with enthusiasm. A deputation from the Jacobins demanded that the Girondists should be speedily brought to justice; a subject which had been agitated in the Jacobin Club a few days before. On the entrance of this deputation Robespierre, with his usual prudence, resigned the chair to Thuriot. Drouet, the post-master, who headed another deputation, exclaimed: "The hour is come to shed the blood of the guilty. Since our virtue, our moderation, and our philosophic ideas have effected nothing, let us become brigands for the public good. It suffices not merely to have arrested suspected persons; I entreat you to tell these *guilty men* that if liberty should be menaced, you will

[1] Von Sybel, iii. 111 (Eng. Transl.).
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 48; *Moniteur*, No. 249, ap. Blanc, t. ix. p. 234.

massacre them without pity." This was too much even for the Convention. Thuriot reminded the speaker that France did not thirst for blood, but justice.[1] Justice, however, as then practised, was only massacre under a new name. Towards the close of the sitting, Barère, as member of the Committee of Public Welfare, presented a Report embodying the prayers of the various petitions. Besides the measures already noticed, it was decreed that a standing army of 6,000 men and 1,200 gunners should be maintained in Paris to execute revolutionary laws and measures of public safety; that Brissot, Vergniaud, Gensonné, Clavière, Le Brun, and his secretary Baudry, should be immediately arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal. Brissot had been arrested at Moulins. A decree forbidding domiciliary visits during the night was revoked. Barère observed in his Report, that according to the *grand mot* of the *Commune*, *terror* was to be the order of the day. "The Royalists desire blood; they shall have that of the conspirators, of Brissot and his faction, of Marie Antoinette. The Royalists wish to disturb the labours of the Convention; conspirators, it is your own that shall be disturbed! they want to destroy the Mountain—the Mountain will crush them!" In this memorable sitting of September 5th, the REIGN OF TERROR was thus distinctly and avowedly inaugurated. The Revolution from its commencement had indeed been a Reign of Terror, and particularly since the massacres of September; but now these atrocities were to be committed orderly and legally,[2] and the means of committing them were permanently organized.

We will here give a few specimens of the legislation of the period. Collot d'Herbois proposed and carried a law that whoever possessed a store of the chief necessaries of life without giving notice of them to the authorities, and offering them daily for sale at the prices which they should fix, should be put to death as a usurer and monopolist. Cambon, thinking to raise the value of the paper money by diminishing the quantity in circulation, proposed that 1,500 million *assignats*, bearing the image of the King, should no longer circulate; and as the value of all paper of course immediately fell, Couthon carried a motion that any one passing *assignats* at less than their nominal value should be

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 40 sqq.

[2] Barère observed: "Ce ne sont pas *des vengeances illégales*, ce sont *les tribunaux extraordinaires* qui vont opérer le mouvement."—*Ibid.* p. 43. At the conclusion of his Report, Barère announced, amid great applause, that a nephew of Pitt's concealed in the château du Caméria, at Dinan, had been arrested. *Ibid.* p. 45.

liable to twenty years' imprisonment in chains, and another that the investing of money in foreign countries should be punished with death![1]

To render despotism complete two things were still wanting: the *loi des suspects*, and the investing of the Government with uncontrolled power.

The *loi des suspects*, passed September 17th, defined suspected persons to be: 1, those who by their conduct, their relations, their conversation, or their writings, had shown themselves enemies of liberty; 2, those who could not prove their means of living, and the discharge of their civic duties; 3, those who had refused certificates of *civism;* 4, public functionaries deprived or suspended by the Convention; 5, *çi-devant* nobles, their husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters, also the agents of emigrants; 6, those who had emigrated between July 1st, 1789, and the publication of the law of April 8th, 1792, notwithstanding that they might have returned into France within the term fixed by that law.[2] Suspected persons were to be arrested and kept under guard at their own cost. Under the extensive and vague definitions of this dreadful law, not a man in France was safe. It was, moreover, to be wielded by Robespierre, who had told Garat: "I have no need to reflect. I am always guided by my *first impressions!*"[3] It was ordered that 50,000 committees should be formed throughout France for the purpose of discovering enemies of the Revolution; and about half that number were actually established, composed of five members, each receiving five francs a day.

The new Constitution was suspended October 10th, on the motion of St. Just, and the Government, till the conclusion of peace, declared *revolutionary;* a term which denoted the suspension of all custom and law, and signified sometimes the sovereign authority of the mob, in this case, the sovereign authority of the Government or Committee of Public Welfare. The Committee now had the surveillance of the Executive Council, the Ministers, the Generals, and all Corporations—in short, a dictatorship.[4]

After the transferrence of Marie Antoinette to the Conciergerie, her fate could be no longer doubtful. She was suffered to languish two or three months in that dungeon, deprived almost of the

[1] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, vol. iii. 172 (Eng. Transl.).

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 109; Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 87 sq. M. Blanc gives this law very imperfectly (t. ix. p. 240).

[3] *Mémoires* de Garat, in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xviii. p. 334.

[4] See 2nd Art. of the Decree in *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 172.

common necessaries of life. Her clothes had fallen to rags, nor was she allowed the means of repairing them; a compassionate turnkey, who ventured to solicit for her a cotton coverlet, was menaced by Fouquier Tinville with the *guillotine*.[1] After her separation from her son, a shoemaker named Simon, a fellow of vulgar and brutal manners, had been appointed tutor to the young Prince, whom he endeavoured to render as low and debased as himself. The Queen was brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal, October 14th, when Fouquier Tinville revived against her all the calumnies circulated in her earlier days by debauched and malignant courtiers, compared her to Messalina, Brunehaut, Fridegonda, Mary de' Medicis, accused her of corrupting the morals of her own son, a boy of eight! This last charge was repeated by the infamous Hébert, amplified, dwelt upon with details which make human nature shudder. Marie Antoinette was silent from horror and indignation: a juryman having insisted on an answer, she exclaimed: "If I have not replied, it is because nature revolts at such a charge against a mother. I appeal to every mother present."[2] This natural and noble answer excited a momentary feeling in her favour. Robespierre exclaimed: "The wretched fool! he will make our enemies the objects of compassion."[3] Hébert, who thus brutally and cynically insulted the descendant of a long line of Emperors, had been a check-taker at the Théâtre des Variétés, had been discharged for dishonesty, and had been convicted of robbing his furnished lodgings. Yet he was now a leading member of the *Commune!* The political charges against Marie Antoinette were, having sent large sums of money to the Emperor, having favoured the Coalition, having exerted an undue influence over her husband, having endeavoured to excite a civil war, &c. Her condemnation was a matter of course. She was drawn to the place of execution in the common cart, and met her fate with unflinching fortitude (October 16th).

The murder of the Queen was soon followed by the execution of the Girondists. On the 24th of October twenty-one of that party, including Brissot, Vergniaud, and Gensonné, were arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal, and found guilty on the 30th of a conspiracy against the unity and indivisibility of the Republic, and the liberty and safety of the French people.[4] The real cause of their fate was their having opposed Robespierre and the Moun-

[1] *Récit* de Madame Bault, ap. Blanc, t. ix. p. 387.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 399.
[3] Von Sybel, iii. p. 236 (Eng. Transl.).
[4] *Hist. Parl. ibid.* p. 450.

tain, and endeavoured to *decentralize* the Revolution, that is, to resist the Paris mob by means of the Departments: but their own conduct, and especially their treatment of the King, deprives them of our commiseration. When their trial had lasted three or four days, a Jacobin deputation having demanded of the Convention that juries should be empowered to put an end to a criminal prosecution whenever they considered themselves satisfied, Robespierre proposed and carried a law (October 29th) that the jury should be interrogated on this point after a trial had lasted three days. On the following morning this law was read to the Revolutionary Tribunal by the Public Accuser, and, after a short deliberation, a verdict of guilty was pronounced against all the prisoners, though not one of them had yet made his defence.[1] The Girondists displayed an unseemly levity during their trial, and amused themselves in prison by a representation of it, in which they mocked and ridiculed the public accuser, the judges, and the jury: symptoms rather of a want of reflection, or the hallucination of despair, than the firmness becoming men who called themselves patriots and statesmen. The body of Valazé, who stabbed himself on hearing his sentence, was carried to the place of execution with the rest.

The next victim of note was the Duke of Orleans, who had been kept in arrest at Marseille since the spring, and had thence been transferred to the Conciergerie. He was condemned on the most inadequate evidence, but it is impossible to feel any pity for him. He met his fate with a hardened indifference, November 7th. Two days after Madame Roland submitted her head to the fatal knife with undaunted courage. Her celebrated exclamation at the scaffold, "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" seems to show that she repented, when too late, of the atrocities she had herself contributed to instigate. Her husband, who had escaped into Normandy, on hearing of her death, committed suicide on the high road near Rouen. Among other victims of this period may be mentioned Bailly, the astronomer and *ci-devant* Mayor of Paris, the deputies Barnave, Kersaint, and Rabaud St. Etienne, the Generals Houchard, Brunet, and Lamartière, and Madame du Barri, the mistress of Louis XV. Of the Girondists who had escaped into the provinces, Salles and Guadet were captured and executed in June, 1794; Barbaroux shot himself near Castillon; Valady, arrested near Périgueux, was executed in that town in December, 1793; the bodies of Pétion and Buzot

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 110.

were discovered half devoured by wolves. A few, as Louvet and Lanjuinais, succeeded in escaping.

In accordance with a maxim that all that is not new in revolutions is pernicious, was introduced a fantastic alteration of the calendar. As Royalty had been abolished September 21st, 1792, it was resolved that the French era should begin from that event, as the commencement of the first year of the Republic. The year was to be composed of twelve months, each of thirty days, divided into decades, each tenth day being a day of repose, instead of Sunday. The names of the days in each decade were *primidi, duodi, tridi, quartidi, quintidi, sextidi, septidi, octidi, nonidi, decadi.* The five supplementary days inserted at the end of the year, and entitled *sansculotides*, formed a kind of festival, of which the first day was sacred to genius, the second to labour, the third to actions, the fourth to recompenses, the fifth to opinion. New names for the months adapted to their character, were suggested by Fabre d'Eglantine. The first month, which answered nearly to October, was called *Vendémiaire*, followed by *Brumaire, Frimaire, Nivose, Pluviose, Ventose, Germinal, Floréal, Prairial, Messidor, Thermidor, Fructidor.* The new calendar was decreed October 24th, 1793, and on the following day, in conformity with it, the *procès verbal* of the Convention was dated 4 *Brumaire an II de la République Française.*[1] It would, however, be unjust to conceal that the Revolutionary Government adopted some useful schemes. The Polytechnic and Normal schools were prepared, the foundations of a civil code were laid, the *Grand Livre*, in which all the national creditors were inscribed, was opened, a uniformity of weights and measures was established, and the decimal system introduced. A certain quantity of distilled water was taken as the unit for weights, a certain fraction of the meridian as the unit of measure, to be multiplied or divided *ad infinitum* by 10.[2]

There now remained little to alter or abolish except in the article of religion. Both Robespierre and the Deists, and Hébert and the Atheists, were resolved to set aside Christianity, but they were not exactly agreed as to what they should substitute in its place. The *Commune*, however, in which the Atheists and Materialists ruled supreme, took the lead. Chaumette, the *procureur-général*, a simpleton who fancied himself a philosopher, was one of the principal leaders in this crusade *against* Christianity, if

[1] If the French had now introduced, or rather revived, the words *septante, octante, nonante*, for their present awkward expressions, *soixante-dix, soixante-onze*, &c., they would have done some good.

[2] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.* t. ix. p. 400.

such an expression may be allowed. He had adopted the motto inscribed by Fouché over the gate of the cemetery of Nevers, that "death is an eternal sleep," and had made several absurd and fantastic alterations in the rites of sepulture, among the rest that the dead should be buried in a three-coloured flag. On the 10th of November he obtained a decree of the *Commune* for inaugurating the "worship of Reason" in the metropolitan Cathedral of Notre Dame. Already, in the month of October, the churches had been desecrated, the images thrown down, the plate and other ornaments carried off, the sacristies broken open, the priests' vestments sold to brokers and old-clothes-men. Petitioners dressed in chasubles, and bearing golden crosses, mitres, and other insignia of the hierarchy, had appeared in grotesque masquerade, and with encouragement instead of reproof, at the bar of the Convention. In this confusion of everything sacred, Anacharsis Clootz and Chaumette, having persuaded Gobel, constitutional Bishop of Paris, to renounce his episcopal office, brought him, accompanied by his twelve vicars, by Pache, the Mayor, and other members of the Municipality, into the Convention; when, declaring that he had abdicated his functions, Gobel resigned his cross and ring; the vicars followed his example, and the President having embraced him, he and his priests put on the red cap, and traversed the Assembly amidst thunders of applause. Gobel's example was followed by a few other bishops and priests. The Goddess of Reason, represented by an actress, was now installed at Notre Dame. In the nave was erected a sort of mountain, having a temple at the top, with the inscription, *A la Philosophie.* A prostitute, dressed as the Goddess of Liberty, came forth from the temple, seated herself on a sort of cloud, having at her feet a truncated column with a lamp called the *flambeau de la vérité.* Here she received the homage of a choir of girls dressed in white, whilst a hymn composed by Marie Joseph Chénier was chanted by all the *sans-culottes* present. The Goddess of Reason was now carried in procession to the Convention; Chaumette introduced her by a speech at the bar; the actress, descending from her throne, was embraced by the President, and took a seat by his side. By such absurd and blasphemous farces did these new Republicans, the legislators of a great nation, delude and disgrace themselves.

These scenes were accompanied with a perfect carnival of atheism, folly, and debauchery. Prostitutes dressed as the Goddess of Reason were paraded in cars through the streets of Paris,

accompanied by opera Hercules's, with pasteboard clubs, and followed by a rabble rout of drunken men and women. Members of the Convention might be seen dancing the *carmagnole* with girls of the town dressed in sacerdotal habits. The relics of St. Geneviève were publicly burnt in the Place de Grève, and a *procès-verbal* of the proceedings was despatched to the Pope. On November 20th the Section of l'Unité sent an enormous mass of church plate as an offering to the Convention. Their deputies were adorned with priestly vestments, copes, and dalmatics, and carried a black flag, typifying the destruction of fanaticism. They sung the air *Marlbroug est mort et enterré*, and danced in the middle of the hall amid the applause of the Convention.[1] The churches were converted into public-houses and brothels, the sculptures of Notre Dame were ordered to be destroyed, and wooden saints, missals, breviaries, and Bibles were consumed in bonfires.[2] The rural districts, however, refused to imitate the madness and profanities of the capital.

Robespierre disapproved of these proceedings. Although a man of blood, he was also a man of order; although a Deist, he was, like his master Rousseau, for tolerating all religions, including that of the Roman Catholic Church. On November 21st he denounced the Atheists to the Jacobin Club as more dangerous enemies of the Revolution even than the priests and Royalists, and stigmatized their tenets as subversive of all political society. "Atheism," he said, "is aristocratic, while the idea of an Omnipotent Being watching over innocence and punishing triumphant crime is altogether popular."[3] He adopted the phrase of Voltaire, that if a God did not exist it would be necessary to invent one; and he concluded by moving that Society should be purged of the traitors concealed in its bosom, and the Committees reorganized. These propositions were unanimously adopted. After this speech the indecent scenes which had disgraced Paris were no longer exhibited. One of the motives of Robespierre and the Committee of Public Welfare for suppressing them was the scandal which they created in foreign countries. Danton supported Robespierre, and Hébert and Chaumette found themselves compelled to make a sort of public recantation of their atheistical tenets.

While such was the state of Paris, the Revolutionary Government was gradually triumphing over its enemies in the provinces. The insurgents of La Vendée had been tolerably successful up to

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 269 sq. [2] L. Blanc, t. ix. p. 482.
[3] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 277.

October. Robespierre's *protégé*, Rossignol, proved totally incompetent for the command of the army sent against them, and sustained some bloody defeats; but he carried out to the letter his instructions to burn and destroy all that he could. His successor, Lechelle, was a man of the same calibre; but Kléber, Marceau, and Westermann, though nominally under his command, acted independently of him, and inflicted on the Vendeans a succession of defeats at Chatillon-sur-Sèvre, La Tremblaye, and Chollet, where Bonchamp was killed, at Granville, at Le Mans, and finally dispersed them at Savenay, December 22nd. An English expedition under Lord Moira fitted out for their aid arrived too late. Henri de Larochejaquelein was killed in a skirmish in the following March by two Republican grenadiers, whose lives he was endeavouring to save. La Vendée was converted into a smoking desert. In the south Marseille had opened its gates to Carteaux, August 25th. But this success decided the revolt of Toulon, a step which the inhabitants had been some months contemplating. Having opened communications with Admiral Hood, who was cruising off that port, the English fleet, accompanied by a Spanish and a Neapolitan squadron, entered the harbour August 27th, and took possession of the place, after a short resistance from a few of the French vessels. On the following day Admiral Hood published a Declaration that he took possession of Toulon in the name of Louis XVII. Two English regiments from Gibraltar, under General O'Hara, and between 12,000 and 13,000 Spanish, Piedmontese, and Neapolitan troops, were subsequently introduced into the town,[1] and the forts around it were occupied. Lyon had been besieged by Kellermann since August 8th. The operations were really conducted by Dubois Crancé, but little progress was made till the end of the month, when the besieging force was largely increased and 100 guns brought into play. The hopes of the inhabitants rested on a diversion to be made by a Piedmontese corps, which, however, was defeated by Kellermann; and Lyon, after sustaining a terrible bombardment, and being reduced to the extremity of famine, was compelled to surrender, October 9th. On the 12th the Convention decreed that the portion of the town inhabited by the rich should be demolished, that

[1] The exact numbers of the garrison were 6,521 Spaniards, 2,421 Englishmen, 4,334 Neapolitans, 1,584 Piedmontese, 1,542 National Guards of Toulon—altogether more than 16,000 men. See Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 488 ff. (vol. iii. p. 244, Eng. Tr.); where will be found new and more correct particulars respecting the occupation of Toulon by the allies, from the account given by an eye-witness to the King of Prussia.

its name should be effaced from the towns of the Republic; that what remained of it should henceforth be called *Commune Affranchie;* and, in the mock sublime of that epoch, it was ordained that a column should be erected on the ruins with the inscription, "Lyon made war upon liberty: Lyon exists no more."[1]

The reduction of Lyon was soon followed by that of Toulon. The force of the allies was weakened by those dissensions which attended all the operations of the Coalition. The inhabitants of Toulon were divided into the two parties of Constitutionalists and Royalists. As the former were the more numerous, and possessed all the municipal offices, the English consulted their views. The Spaniards, on the other hand, adopted all the more warmly the minority, whose religious and political principles coincided with their own. This party demanded the recall of the clergy, and that the Count of Provence should be summoned to Toulon as Regent of France; but as these measures were opposed by the Constitutionalists, they were declined by Admiral Hood. The Spaniards then demanded that the Toulon fleet should be delivered to their Sovereign as a member of the House of Bourbon, although by the capitulation of the town it had been expressly given into English keeping, and the demand was therefore refused.[2] These bickerings, as we shall have to relate further on, laid the foundation of a rupture between Spain and England. The English Government, in conformity with its principle of not prescribing any particular form of government to the French, had even disapproved of Admiral Hood's act in taking possession of Toulon in the name of Louis XVII. The most sinister imputations have been thrown on this policy by French writers of all parties.[3] But the English Cabinet was of opinion that a single town, however respectable, could not decide so momentous a question, nor England determine it without appealing to all the allied Courts. Such a decision, indeed, might have proved a serious embarrassment in any negotiations for peace. The siege of Toulon was first undertaken by Carteaux, a *ci-devant* painter. He was accompanied by the deputy Salicetti, a Corsican, who retained at Toulon his countryman, Napoleon Bonaparte, then a young captain of artillery, the meanness of whose small and, at that time, meagre figure and pallid face was redeemed by his piercing eye and intelligent appearance. The siege made little progress till after the reduction of Lyon; the

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 192; Montgaillard. t. iv. p. 96 sqq.
[2] Von Sybel, *loc. cit.*
[3] See Montgaillard, *Hist. de France*, t. iv. p. 168; L. Blanc, *Hist de la Révol. Fr.* t. x. p. 89.

troops from which place, together with large draughts from the army of Italy, raised the besieging army to more than 60,000 men. The command of this force was now given to Dugommier, an experienced general; but the Convention appointed five commissaries to watch over him, namely, Barras, Fréron, Salicetti, Augustine Robespierre (Maximilian's younger brother), and Ricord, with instructions that Toulon *must* be taken, pointing clearly to the alternative of the *guillotine*. The attack was ultimately conducted after Bonaparte's plan, who saw that a fort occupied by the English on a tongue of land separating the inner and outer roadsteads, was the key of the whole position. The fort was attacked by a picked French column, on the night of December 16th, and, after a desperate resistance, taken. As some of the surrounding forts had also been reduced by the Republicans, General O'Hara, the commander-in-chief, who, with Lord Hood and Sir Gilbert Elliot, formed a directorial commission, found himself compelled to evacuate Toulon; but not before the arsenal and a large part of the French fleet had been burnt, under the conduct of Commodore Sir Sidney Smith. Three ships of the line and twelve frigates were carried off by the English. About 4,000 Toulonese were put on board the allied fleets; but numbers were necessarily left behind. The Republican Commissioners, Fréron, Barras, and the younger Robespierre, took a horrible vengeance on the citizens, and within three months butchered more than 3,000 persons.[1]

Elsewhere, also, the Republican Government signalized its triumphs by a series of the most horrible massacres, executed by its commissaries or proconsuls. At Bordeaux, which had embraced the Girondist cause but for a moment, Tallien and his colleague, Ysabeau, caused 108 persons to be guillotined. Here these two proconsuls lived in state, with a guard at their door, and, while the town was almost in a state of famine, required to be served with the finest wines, the most exquisite delicacies. Tallien acquired a fortune by his peculations.[2] These atrocities were more than rivalled by Fréron and Barras at Marseille, and Collot d'Herbois and Fouché at Lyon. At Marseille was established a Commission of Six, divided for the sake of expedition into two courts, without public accuser or jury. The persons accused, having been asked their names, professions, and fortunes, were sent down to the executioner's cart, which was always standing before the Palais de Justice, and the judges appearing on the

[1] Von Sybel, vol. iii. p. 249 sq. (Eng. Tr.). [2] Prudhomme, *Hist. Générale, &c.*

balcony, pronounced sentence of death. The head of this horrible tribunal, a young man of twenty, condemned 160 persons in ten days.[1] Fréron, in pursuance of his idea, "that every rebel city should disappear from the face of the earth," mutilated most of the public buildings and monuments of Marseille, and called it, "the nameless town." He and Barras appropriated 800,000 francs, which they ought to have paid into the treasury, as the spoils of this city, on pretence that their carriage had been overturned in a ditch.[2] At Lyon Couthon at first seemed inclined to show some mercy; but he was superseded towards the end of October by Collot d'Herbois and Fouché, who caused men, women, and children, rich and poor, to be shot down in masses with artillery; those who escaped the shot were hacked to pieces by the soldiery.[3] The number of victims is stated at 410, but the accounts vary.[4] About forty houses were demolished by artillery, and a great many more damaged; but to raze Lyon to the ground was found to be too vast an undertaking.

But all these atrocities were outdone by the infamous Carrier, at Nantes. The first act of this monster on arriving at Nantes, October 8th, when the Vendean war was still going on, was to form the *Campagnie de Marat*, to make domiciliary visits, and arrest suspected persons, of whom 600 were thrown into prison. Carrier was intoxicated with blood. He threatened to throw half the town of L'Orient into the sea, and ordered General Haxo to exterminate all the inhabitants of La Vendée, and burn their dwellings.[5] The *noyades*, or drownings, commenced towards the end of *Brumaire*. Priests sentenced to transportation were placed in a vessel, with a sort of trap-door, which proceeded down the Loire, and, the bolts being withdrawn, the unhappy victims were drowned. Carrier facetiously called this *vertical* deportation. Young men and women, bound together, were thrown into the river, a mode of execution pleasantly styled "the Republican marriage." Hundreds of infants were also drowned. This was called "Republican baptism." The water of the Loire was infected to such an extent by the multitude of corpses, that the police forbade the citizens of Nantes to drink it, or to eat the fish caught in it. The lowest estimate of the victims of Carrier's blood-thirstiness during the four months of his operations at

[1] L. Blanc, t. x. p. 158.

[2] Barère, *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 13.

[3] M. Blanc appears to think that Lyon required a little *bleeding:* "Il convient de dire, pour être juste envers tous, que le mal à Lyon semblait appeler l'emploi de *remèdes énergiques*," t. x. p. 164.

[4] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. pp. 397, 399.

[5] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. pp. 173, 218.

Nantes amounts to 15,000.[1] Carrier is said to have used his power to force the chastity of women, and to have put to death husbands who would not consent to their dishonour.

We will now return to the campaign. After the fall of Valenciennes, a rapid march on Paris would probably have proved successful. The immense northern frontier of France was defended only by a few isolated camps, the interior was in combustion, while the allies had nearly 300,000 men between Basle and Ostend. But their conduct was guided first by their own selfish and separate interests, and next by the ancient routine maxims of strategy, which required the reduction of the frontier fortresses. Prince Coburg, therefore, resolved to reduce Quesnoy, and the Duke of York had instructions from London to lay siege to Dunkirk. From Paris as a centre Carnot[2] directed all the operations of the French armies on the vast circumference threatened. The Duke of York sat down before Dunkirk towards the end of August, 1793. His total force, including 12,000 Austrians under Alvinzi, amounted to about 36,000 men. These were divided into two corps, one of siege, the other of observation; the first being commanded by himself, while the other, under Marshal Freitag, was posted at Hondschoote. Houchard, an ignorant, incapable man, who had gained the favour of the Committee of Public Welfare by his democratic swagger, had succeeded Kilmaine in the command of the French army of the North. He was popular with the soldiery; but the fate of Custine rendered him somewhat solicitous about his own. This feeling was increased by a visit from the terrible Billaud Varennes, who caused twenty-two adjutants-general to be arrested in one night![3] Next morning Houchard found himself without a staff. By orders from Paris, Houchard attacked Freitag at Hondschoote, September 8th, and completely defeated him. Freitag was slain in the engagement, but Walmoden, who succeeded him, effected a retreat to Furnes. The Duke of York was now in a perilous situation. He was encamped in a sort of peninsula: instead of an English fleet, which he had expected, a French squadron had arrived, and molested his right flank; if the victorious enemy advanced, he must either lay down his arms or be driven into the sea; he was, therefore, compelled to raise the siege precipitately, abandoning fifty-two guns and his baggage. It was generally thought, even in England, that

[1] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. ii. S. 499 (vol. iii. p. 257 Eng. Tr.).

[2] Carnot's military genius devised that new system of warfare which, by rapidly concentrating a superior force on a given point, effected such wonders in the hands of Napoleon.

[3] L. Blanc, t. ix. p. 288.

had Houchard pushed on, the Duke and his whole army must have been captured;[1] but that general suffered him to form a junction with Walmoden at Furnes, where they presented too strong a front to be attacked. Houchard contented himself with dispersing an isolated Dutch force at Menin, September 13th. Advancing thence, two days after, to meet the Austrian General Beaulieu, his troops were seized with one of those unaccountable panics so frequent in the wars of the Revolution, and which it was the fashion to ascribe to treachery. Cries having arisen of "We are betrayed! *Sauve qui peut!*" the French fled in disorder to Lille. For this misfortune, and for not having attacked the Duke of York, Houchard was deprived of his command and subsequently guillotined. He was succeeded by Jourdan.

Le Quesnoy surrendered to the Austrians September 9th, after a siege of fourteen days. Prince Coburg now determined to close the campaign by the reduction of Maubeuge and Landrecies, which would render him master of the valley of the Sambre, and to march on Paris the following year. But Jourdan, acting under the directions of Carnot, who was present, saved Maubeuge by defeating the Austrians at Wattignies, a neighbouring height, after a bloody battle which lasted two days (October 16th). General Ferrant, Commandant of Maubeuge, who had neglected to assist the army of liberation, was arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal and executed. But the victory of Wattignies was followed by no results. General Davesnes having failed through sheer capacity in an attempt to invade maritime Flanders, expiated with his head his want of success; and Jourdan himself was deprived of the command for not passing the Sambre after his victory. The retreat of the Austrians was unmolested, and they soon after took up their winter quarters in the environs of Le Quesnoy, Valenciennes, and Condé. The Duke of York did the same at Tournay, covering Flanders, while the French established themselves at Guise.

Towards the Rhine, the Prussians, after the capture of Mentz, had remained almost entirely inactive, notwithstanding the pressing invitations of Wurmser, the Austrian general in Alsace, to join him in vigorous operations. The views of the Prussians were fixed on Poland, and the French campaign was little more than a blind to their projects in that quarter. A temporary disappointment there, coupled with some discussions with Austria, induced

[1] *Ann. Register*, 1793, p. 192. All French military authorities, Jomini, Soult, &c., are of the same opinion. Von Sybel, iii. 201.

Frederick William suddenly to abandon his allies. It is impossible for us to detail the sinuous policy of the two German States at this period. It will suffice to state that Austria had wished to reap the Bavarian succession after the death of the Elector Charles Theodore, who had no legitimate children; but had been induced to relinquish the project through the repugnance to it of the Bavarians themselves, the opposition of the next heirs, the Princes of Zweybrücken, as well as of Prussia, the representations of England, and lastly also, the unwillingness of Charles Theodore himself to consent. Although Austria had abandoned this claim, yet, as her relinquishment of it was unknown to Prussia, she brought it forward in some negotiations which took place at the King of Prussia's head-quarters towards the end of August, with the view of merely covering some demands for a share of Poland, and making a merit of relinquishing Bavaria. The discovery of this duplicity excited the King of Prussia's indignation, which was increased by the knowledge that Austria intended seizing Alsace for herself. Frederick William's ill humour was further increased by news from Poland to the purport that the negotiations for securing his share of that country were going on anything but favourably. He now recollected that he had promised his aid in the French war solely for the campaign of 1793, and that only on condition of acquisitions in Poland; and about the middle of September he announced to the Austrians his intention of quitting the Coalition.[1] In this step he completely disregarded the treaty which he had entered into with England only two months before for the better prosecution of the war with France. Towards the end of September, Frederick William II. withdrew from his army, alleging the necessity of joining his troops assembling on the frontiers of Poland.[2] Thus was the first blow struck at the Coalition.

The French had made two ineffectual attempts to pass the Rhine; they had also been repulsed with great loss in an attack upon the Duke of Brunswick's position at Pirmasens, September 14th; but neither this success nor the remonstrances of the British Ambassador, could stimulate the Duke to action. At length he was induced to join Wurmser in an attack upon the French lines between Weissenburg and Lauterburg, October 13th; when the French, defeated at every point, were compelled to evacuate those two places, and to make a hasty retreat towards the Geisberg.

[1] For these affairs see Von Sybel, Book vii. ch. 6.

[2] For the affairs of that country see next chapter.

Wurmser entered Hagenau October 17th; but he also displayed some remissness, and allowed the French to escape to Strasburg. This town would probably have opened its gates to the Austrians if Wurmser would have assured the inhabitants that possession of it should be taken in the name of Louis XVII.; but such an arrangement was contrary to the policy of the Austrian Cabinet, which aimed at the recovery of Alsace. But the plot was discovered. St. Just and Lebas arrived at Strasburg October 22nd, as Commissaries or Proconsuls of the Convention. St. Just immediately began to display his power. The day after his arrival he degraded the Commandant Lacour to the ranks, for having struck a soldier in a moment of excitement. On the 24th he proclaimed that "If there are in the army any traitors, or even any men indifferent to the people's cause, we bring with us the sword to strike them!"[1] He erected the military tribunal attached to the army of the Rhine into a special and *Revolutionary* Commission; and he ordered General Eisenberg and a number of officers who had been surprised by the enemy and fled, to be shot in the redoubt of Hähnheim. Thus the Reign of Terror prevailed even in the camp. St. Just, who has been characterized as having a head of fire with a heart of ice, was its fitting instrument.[2] The citizens of Strasburg were treated like the soldiery. The property of the rich, even their beds and apparel, was confiscated for the use of the army. A forced loan of nine millions (360,000*l.*), payable in twenty-four hours, was exacted from a certain list of persons. One of them not having been able to raise his *quota* in the given time, was exposed three hours on the scaffold of the *guillotine;* another, an hotel-keeper, who had been assessed at 40,000 francs, presented the keys of his house to St. Just, and requested him to discharge his debts.[3]

Wurmser had engaged in the siege of Landau, in which he expected the co-operation of the Prussians. But the Duke of Brunswick having failed in an attempt upon the castle of Bitsch, in the Vosges, took occasion to effect a retreat, which he had long contemplated, and retired to Kaiserslautern. He was followed by the French, under Hoche, who, however, after some bloody engagements (28th, 29th, and 30th of December), were forced to retreat. The Duke of Brunswick's movements having exposed the Austrian right, Hoche despatched a division of 12,000 men through the Vosges to take them in flank, while Pichegru at-

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxi. p. 37. [2] Barère, *Mém.* t. ii. p. 235.
[3] L. Blanc, t. x. p. 129.

tacked them in front. Hoche himself assailed and dispersed without a blow the Palatine and Bavarian troops at Werdt, December 22nd, 1793. Wurmser was now compelled to retreat in disorder to the Geisberg; the armies of the Rhine and Moselle formed a junction, while the retrograde movement of the Austrians had also united them with the Prussians. But the Austrians being attacked and defeated by the French at the Geisberg, December 26th, Wurmser, disgusted with the conduct of the Prussians, resolved to abandon them, and crossed the Rhine between Philippsburg and Mannheim, December 30th; when the Prussians fell back towards Mentz.[1] Thus, as the result of the campaign in this quarter, the French reoccupied the lines of Weissenburg, raised the blockade of Landau, recovered Alsace, and took up their winter quarters in the Palatinate.

On the Spanish frontier, where the French were not able to employ an adequate force, the campaign of 1793 left the Spaniards in possession of St. Elmo, Collioure, and Port Vendre, on the eastern side of the Pyrenees. On the western, nothing important was done, and the Spaniards maintained their positions. On the side of Piedmont, Masséna succeeded in holding the Austro-Sardinian army in check. The French arms were for the most part unsuccessful in the colonies. In the East Indies Chandernagore, Pondicherry, and one or two smaller settlements fell into the hands of the English, who also captured in the West Indies, Tobago, St. Pierre, and Miquelon, but failed in attempts upon Martinico and St. Domingo. In the last named island, the negroes had risen against their masters; the Commissaries Santhonax and Polverel, despatched thither by the Republican Government with unlimited powers, sided with the insurgents, admitted the coloured population to a sudden and complete participation in all political rights, and rendered the colony one vast scene of desolation.[2]

As the Revolution proceeded, parties continued to separate. The *Gironde* had supplanted the Constitutionalists, and had in its turn been overthrown by the *Montagne*. The Revolution, it has been said, like Saturn, devoured its own children. In the democratic residuum still left we find three distinct factions. First, the ultra-democrats, called *Hébertistes* and *Enragés*, who were for terror in all its wildest excesses, for atheism in its most absurd and blasphemous forms. In contradistinction to this faction had sprung up what was called *le parti de la clémence*, or party of mercy, at the head of which was Camille Desmoulins; and, strange

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 421 sqq. [2] Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 45.

to say, Danton also seemed to incline to it. Danton was not *incorruptible*, like Robespierre, but he had more of human nature in his composition. He had made a comfortable fortune by his patriotism, had married a young wife, and was inclined to enjoy the position he had achieved. Between these two parties stood that of Robespierre, St. Just, and Couthon, who desired a sort of political and regulated terror, which they disguised under the sacred name of justice.[1] Being now members of the Government, they had become more conservative without being a whit less cruel; and they were indignant at seeing the direction of the populace, by means of which they had themselves risen, taken out of their hands by men like Hébert and his companions. As the year 1793 drew to a close, it became evident that a deadly struggle between these parties was at hand.

Robespierre at first showed symptoms of adhesion to the "party of mercy." Camille Desmoulins, who had been his schoolfellow, had started a journal called the *Vieux Cordelier*, in which he advocated the principles of the old Cordelier Club, now governed by Hébert's party. Robespierre had saved Danton as well as Desmoulins from being expelled the Jacobins; had patronized the *Vieux Cordelier*, had even revised the first two numbers. But the brilliant and fickle author soon overstepped the bounds of discretion. In his third number, he not obscurely likened the atrocities of the Reign of Terror, which he ascribed to the treacherous plans of the Hébertistes, to some of the worst passages in the history of the Roman Emperors; and, under pretence of denying, betrayed his real design by protesting beforehand against any comparison which malignity might draw between the present times and those whose pictures he had borrowed from Tacitus. By this language he offended a large number of the Mountain, who had participated in, or approved of these atrocities. In his fourth number he went still further. He demanded a *Committee of Clemency*, the flinging open of the prisons, and the liberation of 200,000 *suspects*. Unluckily, on that very day, Robespierre had proposed in the Convention a *Committee of*

[1] The Terrorists had begun to discover that their favourite method would not accomplish everything. Thus, St. Just observes in his *Institutions:* "La *terreur* peut nous débarrasser de la monarchie et de l'aristocratie; mais qui nous délivrera de la *corruption?*" And again: "L'exercice de la *terreur* a blasé le crime, comme les liqueurs fortes blasent le palais." See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxv. pp. 284, 290. Mingled with some sensible remarks, the *Institutions* of St. Just present the most monstrous specimens of fanaticism and absurdity. Among other regulations, he was for making every proprietor rear four sheep annually for every acre he possessed (*Hist. Parl.* t. xxxv. p. 340). France would have been devoured by its own flocks.

Justice, the new name for Terror;[1] which, however, was not adopted.

It is probable that Robespierre had patronized for a while the Party of Clemency only that he might the more securely overwhelm that of the *Hébertistes*. The contest, however, was initiated by the Cordelier Club, then, as we have said, under the influence of Hébert and Collot d'Herbois, by sending several insolent deputations to the Convention. Robespierre, by defending Camille Desmoulins, seemed to have incurred the dangerous charge of *modérantisme*. He explained and defended his views in his *Report on the principles of the Revolutionary Government*, presented to the Convention in the name of the Committee of Public Welfare, December 25th, 1793.[2] He there described the course of the Government as lying between two extremes, weakness and *modérantisme* on the one hand, rashness and excess on the other; and he evidently hinted at the denunciation of Hébert and Baron Clootz.[3] But at this time he had begun to quail under the attacks of Hébert and the Cordeliers. He publicly denied having taken any part in Camille Desmoulins' journal, and even proposed that it should be burnt. He also turned upon his former coadjutor, Fabre d'Eglantine, who was placed in confinement. And to show that the charge of *modérantisme*, or clemency, was an unjust imputation, he concluded by proposing a decree for accelerating the judgment of foreigners and generals charged with crimes like those of Dumouriez, Custine, Lamarlière, and Houchard.

The *Hébertistes* thought of trying their strength by an insurrection. They took occasion of the distress produced by the severe winter to spread pamphlets, attributing to the Convention all the miseries of Paris; but they failed in their attempt to excite the *Commune*, and consequently to raise the mob. The proletaries now looked up exclusively to the Committee of Public Welfare; among the citizens of a better class there was but one voice of scorn and horror for Hébert and his companions; while at the decisive moment, Henriot, the military leader of the *Commune*,

[1] M. Blanc, a partisan of Robespierre *quand même*, thinks that the views of the party of clemency were altogether unseasonable and absurd—that they demanded for the *régime* of liberty *militant* what was only suitable for that of liberty *victorious*. *Hist. de la Rév. Fr.* t. x. p. 230; cf. p. 206. It was right, therefore, that the executions should go on.

[2] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 458 sqq.

[3] "L'ami des rois et le procureur général du genre humain s'entendent assez bien. Le fanatique couvert de scapulaires et le *fanatique qui prêche l'athéisme* ont entre eux beaucoup de rapports. Les *barons démocrates* sont les frères des marquis de Coblenz."—*Ibid.* p. 461.

went over to Robespierre.[1] On the night of March 13th, 1794, after a speech by St. Just in the Convention, Hébert, and the leaders of his party, Chaumette, Vincent, Clootz, Ronsin, and others, were arrested. Their trial, which lasted three days, was, like the others of that epoch, a mere parody of justice; but though the charges brought against them were futile, most of them richly deserved their fate. They were executed, March 24th, to the number of nineteen. Hébert died like a coward. Their execution was followed by considerable changes. The *Commune* was reconstructed; Pache, the Mayor, was replaced by Lescot Fleuriot; the revolutionary army was disbanded; and the Cordelier Club was broken up.

The Dantonists were the next victims. Danton had been troublesome by demanding an examination of the conduct of public functionaries, and that the Committees should give an account of their acts. As if a Government which had declared itself *revolutionary,* that is irresponsible, was to be questioned! Tallien brought about an interview between Robespierre and Danton, in which the latter is said to have shed tears. On the very same day that Robespierre had determined on his death, he took Danton in his carriage for an excursion beyond the barriers![2] Camille Desmoulins was included in the proscription. It is probable that he owed his fate to the spite of St. Just. He had said of that demagogue, who wore a very stiff cravat, "that he carried his head with respect, like the holy sacrament;" on which St. Just is said to have observed: "And I will make him carry his like a St. Denis." On the night of March 30th, Danton, Desmoulins, Phillippeaux, and Lacroix were arrested, after a deliberation of the two Committees united. Legendre next day demanded that they should be tried at the bar of the Convention. Robespierre opposed this in a speech in which he described Danton as a "pretended idol long since rotten;" when Legendre stuttered out some cowardly excuses. St. Just gave them the *coup de grâce* in an harangue in which he had the effrontery to say that he denounced them as the last partisans of royalty! Chabot, Bazire, Fabre d'Eglantine, Delaunay, Julien (of Toulouse), were also at this time prisoners at the Luxembourg, on a charge of forgery, and they were tried with the Dantonists, April 2nd; also Hérault de Séchelles and Westermann. Danton bellowed out his defence, so that his voice was audible on the other side of the Seine. But it was to no purpose; the prisoners were of

[1] Levasseur, *Mém.* t. iii. p. 40.

[2] Von Sybel, vol. iii. 296 (Eng. Tr.).

course foredoomed. The trial was stopped on the fourth day, and the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, though not a fourth part of the prisoners had been heard in their defence. From their violence, and the symptoms displayed by the audience, the Court was afraid to pass sentence on the accused at the bar; it was read to them by their jailer. They were guillotined April 5th. Camille Desmoulins, almost in a state of madness, tore his clothes to pieces in the cart, and was almost naked when he arrived at the scaffold. He cried to the people that they were deceived; but Danton told him to be quiet and leave that vile *canaille* alone. Danton, during his imprisonment, had said of the Committee of Public Welfare that they were all Cain's brethren—that Brissot would have *guillotined* him as Robespierre had done. "What proves Robespierre a Nero," he remarked, "was, that he had never spoken to Camille Desmoulins with so much friendship as on the eve of his arrest."[1]

By the defeat of the two factions of Dantonists and Hébertistes, the Committee of Public Welfare seemed to have acquired irresistible power. The triumph of Robespierre was complete. The Convention decreed the dissolution of the Ministerial Council, and the formation in its stead of twelve Committees, for the discharge of the various functions of government. Robespierre filled these boards with obscure persons. The Municipality was also reformed, and the posts in it distributed according to Robespierre's bidding. The tribunals of the Departments were suppressed, and that of Paris became the sole one. Society was to be reorganized, and every individual brought under the immediate control of Government. But in this plenitude of power Robespierre trembled for his existence. The members of the governing Committee looked upon one another with hatred and suspicion, as if each were plotting against his colleague's life, whilst all were regarded by moderate people with abhorrence. A strong body of men slept in Robespierre's house, and, armed with clubs, accompanied him in his walks. At meals, two pistols were placed by his plate, and he ate nothing that had not been previously tasted.[2] To show that the Government could not be charged with *modérantisme*, the executions kept their usual course. Good and bad were involved in a like fate. Among the victims of this period may be mentioned Dépresmenil, Le Chapelier, the venerable Malesherbes, Lavoisier the chemist, General Dillon, Chaumette, Gobel, the apostate bishop. The execution of

[1] L. Blanc, t. x. p. 369. [2] Von Sybel, vol. iii. p. 299 (Eng. Tr.).

numbers of women outdoes the other brutalities of the Reign of Terror. The wives of Danton and Camille Desmoulins, the Princess Elizabeth, the meek and saint-like sister of Louis XVI., were sent to the scaffold. Robespierre is said to have told Maret, the bookseller, that he had wished to save Madame Elizabeth, but that Collot d'Herbois prevented it.[1] The latter, who had been an unsuccessful actor and indifferent writer, was the only one of Hébert's faction who had obtained a seat in the Committee of Public Welfare.

Robespierre, having triumphed over the Atheists, proceeded to establish the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul by a decree of the Convention! (18th *Floréal*, May 7th, 1794). It was not, however, the God of the Scriptures, but the God of Reason, substituted for the Goddess of Reason. The new Calendar was retained, by which Sundays were abolished, and, in their stead, every tenth day was set apart for worship. A fête, planned by David the painter, was got up in honour of the new Deity, intended to outrival that of the Hébertistes (June 8th). An amphitheatre was erected in the gardens of the Tuileries, with seats for the members of the Convention, whilst over the basin was erected a group of monsters representing Atheism, Egotism, Discord, and Ambition. Robespierre, who might himself be called the incarnation of the last three, caused himself to be named President of the Assembly for the occasion, and dressed himself in a sky-blue coat. After a speech to the members, whom he had kept waiting some hours, he proceeded to set fire to the monsters, when, after their destruction, the figure of Wisdom was to appear in the midst; unfortunately, however, the flames caught its veil, and the statue appeared in a very blackened condition! The members of the Convention then walked in procession to the Champ de Mars, dressed in the uniform of representatives *en mission*, with feathers in their hats, and a three-coloured sash. In the midst of them was an antique car, drawn by eight oxen with gilt horns, and carrying a trophy composed of instruments of art. Robespierre, as President, marched at the head of the deputies; his colleagues in the Committees kept as far behind him as they could, in order, it is said, to make his position appear the more invidious; for they had already resolved on his destruction.[2] In the centre of the Champ de Mars rose a symbolical

[1] Beaulieu, *Essais histor. sur la Révol.* t. vi. p. 10 note.

[2] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.* t. x. p. 458.

mountain, on which the deputies took their seats, and a hymn to the Supreme Being was sung, composed by the same Marie Joseph Chénier,[1] whose facile muse had a little while before celebrated the triumph of atheism. The spectacle, we are told, was one of inconceivable grandeur, and we may readily believe that there was considerable scenic effect. Robespierre was at the height of his glory. His customary morosity seemed to have vanished: never had he been observed so radiant. But there were not wanting those who, like the slave in the Roman triumph, audibly whispered some discomforting doubts. "Is he not the chief priest? See, it is not enough to be master, he must be a god as well! There may, however, still be a Brutus!" Among the foremost to insult him were Bourdon de l'Oise and Merlin de Thionville. Robespierre, so exulting in the morning, returned to his lodgings, at Duplay's, alarmed and dejected.[2]

St. Just had also given offence by his haughtiness; he had had a violent quarrel with Carnot, and a complete schism had taken place in the Committee of Public Welfare. Robespierre, St. Just, and Couthon now stood alone. The treatment Robespierre had met with at the fête determined him to strike the terrorists of the Committee of General Safety, and the Commissaries of the Convention who had rendered themselves notorious by their cruelties, such as Fouché, Fréron, Tallien, Carrier. With this view he introduced the terrible law called the "Law of 22nd *Prairial*" (June 10th), intended to accelerate the trial of the conspirators. By this law the Revolutionary Tribunal was again re-formed. It was now to consist of a president, three vice-presidents, a public accuser and four substitutes, twelve judges, and fifty jurymen; and for practice it was to be divided into sections of twelve members, each section having not fewer than seven jurors. Its object was said to be to punish the enemies of the people; in which category were included those who had sought to create dearth, to inspire discouragement, to spread false news, to mislead public opinion, to corrupt the public conscience, to alter the energy and purity of revolutionary and republican principles, &c. &c. In short, it was a net to catch all fish. The accused were not to be allowed counsel; it was not necessary to call witnesses; the decision was left to "the conscience of jurymen enlightened by the love of their country." There was no appeal, and the sole punishment was death! By

[1] André Chénier, his brother, also a poet, and a much better one, was guillotined July 25th.

[2] Esquiros, *Hist. des Montagnards*, ap. Blanc, t. x. p. 459.

Article 20, all previous laws relating to the Tribunal were abrogated. This would do away with the law which forbade any member of the Convention to be brought before the Tribunal, unless a decree of accusation had been previously obtained against him; and thus the Convention would be placed at the mercy of Robespierre and his two colleagues; since the signatures of three members of the Committee of Public Welfare sufficed to send a man to trial. The Convention took the alarm, and though Robespierre and Couthon succeeded in carrying the article, it was not till after a long and warm discussion which served to expose their motives.[1] Robespierre and Couthon were next day called to a severe account by the rest of the Committee, who had not been consulted, when a violent scene ensued. Robespierre was so loud that it was necessary to shut the windows, in order that he might not be heard by the people on the terrace of the Tuileries. Billaud Varennes charged him with wishing to guillotine the members of the Convention; Robespierre retorted by accusing Billaud of counter-revolutionary projects. Stormy scenes also took place in the Convention. Bourdon and Tallien were so alarmed by Robespierre's threats that the former took to his bed for a month, while the latter wrote him a humble letter of submission.[2]

After this Robespierre ceased to attend the Committee. This was a mistake, as it enabled his adversaries all the better to combine against him. What was his motive? A real disgust of the system of terror? Such a supposition seems improbable. By the law of 22nd *Prairial* he had increased the means of terror. It was evidently a political move, though a mistaken one. As he had overcome the *Hébertistes* or *Enragés* by means of the *indulgens*, and the *indulgens* by the cry for "justice," so now he wanted to overthrow his opponents in the Committee by reconciling himself with the moderate party and the remnant of the Girondists. In a speech at the Jacobins, 13th *Messidor* (July 1st), he denounced the system of terror, at the same time proclaiming unceasing war against all counter-revolutionists. In another address at the same place, 23rd *Messidor*, he pursued the same subject, and demanded that Fouché should be brought to account for his atrocities at Lyon.[3] In an artful passage of the former speech, he complained that the calumnies forged against

[1] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. p. 193 sqq. Cf. t. xxxvi. p. 5.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 214, 224; Le Cointre, ap. Blanc, t. x. p. 490.
[3] *Ibid.* t. xxxiii. pp. 323, 342.

him in London were repeated by his enemies in Paris; thus insinuating that all who said anything to his prejudice were implicated in the great foreign conspiracy recently invented and denounced.

The story of this conspiracy had been got up on occasion of an attempt to assassinate Collot d'Herbois by a man named Admiral, and was subsequently applied to a suspected design of a young woman named Cécile Rénault on the life of Robespierre. No satisfactory evidence was produced against Cécile; she had, however, avowed that she preferred a king to 50,000 tyrants, and that she had gone to Robespierre's house to see what a tyrant was like.[1] The Committee of General Safety contrived to involve fifty-two other persons of all ranks, ages, and sexes in this pretended conspiracy. It is said that Robespierre had nothing to do with their trial, that it was, in fact, got up by his enemies to place him in an invidious light; that in order to forward this object, Fouquier Tinville, the Public Accuser of the Revolutionary Tribunal, at the suggestion of a member of the Committee, ordered fifty-four red shirts, the costume of parricides, to be prepared for the condemned persons. The procession of the victims (June 17th, 1794) was all the more striking, as the *guillotine* had now been removed to the Barrière du Trône, and the carts had consequently to pass through the Faubourg St. Antoine. This affair of the *Chemises rouges*, as it was called, was soon followed by that of a pretended conspiracy in the prisons. The Committee of Public Welfare authorized Hermann, a Commissary of Civil Administration, to investigate plots in prisons, by an *arrêté*, dated 7th *Messidor* an II (June 25th, 1794), and signed by Robespierre, Billaud Varennes, and Barère.[2] Robespierre, therefore, appears to have retained the power of signing decrees, though he had now absented himself from the Committee; but we are not aware that any later signature can be produced. An *arrêté* for the execution of some prisoners, though signed by St. Just, 2nd *Thermidor* (July 20th), bears neither the name of Robespierre nor of Couthon.[3] One of the substitutes of the Public Accuser charged Hermann with proposing to the Committee "to sweep out the prisons in order to depopulate France and make Robespierre dictator."[4] A list was made out of 159 persons confined in the Luxembourg, including the Prince d'Hénin, the Duke de Gêvres, thirty-nine nobles, the ex-prior

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. p. 103.
[2] *Ibid.* t. xxxv. p. 43.
[3] L. Blanc, t. xi. p. 110.
[4] *Hist. Parl.* loc. cit.

of the Chartreux, several general and other officers, bankers, &c. They were nearly all condemned and executed 19th, 21st, 22nd *Messidor* (July 7th, 9th, 10th). These executions were followed by that of several prisoners in the *Carmes*.

It is impossible to ascertain Robespierre's share in these atrocities after his withdrawal from the Committee. It is, however, certain that after that event the number of executions vastly increased. In the forty-five days which elapsed from the assumed date of his retirement (June 11th) till his overthrow on the 9th *Thermidor* (July 27th), 1285 persons were guillotined, while during the forty-five days immediately preceding, only 577 persons had suffered.[1] It was after his retirement that people were sent to the *guillotine* in what were called *fournées* or batches, by which speedy method one person was often executed in mistake for another. We must recollect, however, that Robespierre had at least facilitated this wholesale butchery by his law of 22nd *Prairial*.

The Committees of Public Welfare and of General Safety endeavoured to persuade the Convention that they were all embarked in a common cause; that a massacre of the deputies was intended, and they tried to convince each individually of his personal danger. Robespierre and Couthon, on the other hand, in their speeches at the Jacobins, professed the greatest respect for the Convention, asserted that their eyes were fixed only on five or six of its members—"five or six little human creatures, whose hands are full of the wealth of the Republic, and at the same time dripping with the blood of the innocent persons whom they have sacrificed."[2] Every means was used to show Robespierre in an invidious light as a would-be dictator and a patron of superstition and priestcraft. With the last view, a false and ridiculous story was invented of his being a disciple of one Catharine Theot, a crazy old woman, who, like Joanna Southcott in England, gave out that she was the mother of God. The Convention was convulsed with laughter at the story, whilst Robespierre gnashed his teeth with rage. With respect to the political charge, St. Just actually proposed in a meeting of the two Committees (July 23rd) that Robespierre should be named Dictator. The anecdote is recorded and believed by the republican editors of the *Histoire Parlementaire*,[3] on the authority of a

[1] This is M. Blanc's statement, t. xi. p. 115. But the number executed after Robespierre's retirement seems understated by more than 1,000. See Croker's *Essays*, p. 447 sqq.

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii p. 387. [3] *Ibid.* p. 359.

man of probity who had heard it from Barère, and is confirmed by Barère's *Mémoires*,[1] published subsequently to the *Histoire Parlementaire*. We cannot, therefore, with M. Blanc, reject the story merely on the negative ground that Billaud Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, and Barère did not charge St. Just with this act on the 9th *Thermidor*.

Robespierre might probably have overcome his enemies by an insurrection, for Lescot Fleuriot, the Mayor of Paris, and Henriot, the Commander of the National Guard, were devoted to him. But Robespierre had never openly approved this mode of action, though he had sometimes secretly stimulated it. He relied on his *moral* influence, and imagined that he should overcome all opposition by the speech which he had prepared. The Committee endeavoured to come to an accommodation with him and his party, and had sent for him for that purpose, 5th *Thermidor* (July 22nd). But a reconciliation was found to be impracticable. Religious differences seem to have been one of the chief obstacles to it—such were the prejudices and animosities of these free-thinkers! Billaud Varennes and Collot d'Herbois could not endure to hear of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, while St. Just found it horrible that they should blush for a Divinity.[2]

After the failure of this attempt at accommodation, nothing remained but a trial of strength in the Convention. Robespierre's enemies bound themselves by an oath that they would assassinate him in the midst of the Assembly, if they failed in persuading it against him. Robespierre began the attack by a long speech, 8th *Thermidor* (July 26th), in which he explained and defended his principles, repelled the charge of aiming at a dictatorship. He concluded by proposing to purge and renew both the Committees, to constitute a United Government under the Convention, and to punish traitors.[3] His speech, though elaborated and written with great care, was very ill suited to his purpose. It consisted of vague and general charges, and was but the preface to a Report to be delivered the following day by St. Just, in which their opponents were to be personally denounced. Hence it excited general alarm, nor would Robespierre respond to the cries of "Name! Name!" Had he spoken his mind clearly, had he denounced, without long phrases, the crimes which had been committed, the names of those who had committed them, and stated the

[1] T. ii. p. 213 sq. See also Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.* t. iii. p. 596; Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. iii. S. 218 ff. (vol. iv. p. 53, Eng. Tr.)

[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 16.

[3] *Ibid.* t. xxxiii. pp. 406-448.

good which he himself proposed to do, his address might probably have been hailed with applause, and the accusation of his enemies decreed. The manner in which his speech was received seems to have alarmed Robespierre himself. He read it in the evening at the Jacobins, where it was heard with great applause; but he called it his "testament of death," talked of drinking the hemlock. His friends exhorted him to try an insurrection, but he declined. On the same evening some emissaries of the Mountain persuaded several members of the Right to join them, and thus to escape the *guillotine* and put an end to the Reign of Terror.[1]

On the morning of 9th *Thermidor* (July 27th), St. Just mounted the tribune of the Convention and began to read his Report. He had announced his intention to do so overnight in the Committee of Public Welfare, and had not concealed that he should attack some of its members. He had scarcely read a few lines when he was violently interrupted by Tallien and Billaud Varennes,[2] who denounced the designs of Robespierre and his accomplices, and accused them of a plot to massacre the Convention. These remarks were received with loud and general applause. Robespierre rushed to the tribune, but his voice was drowned with cries of *A bas le tyran!* Tallien violently exclaimed, that if the Convention had not the courage to decree the accusation of the "new Cromwell," he would stab him to the heart; at the same time drawing forth and brandishing a dagger. He then demanded that Henriot and his *état-major* should be accused, that the Assembly should sit in permanence. Both were decreed by acclamation, amidst cries of *Vive la République!* as well as the arrest of Dumas, Boulanger, and Dufraise, three of Robespierre's boldest partisans. Robespierre, who still remained at the tribune, made several ineffectual attempts to obtain a hearing; his voice was always drowned by cries of *A bas le tyran!* and by the bell of the President Thuriot. He looked wistfully at the Mountain, but it gave no signs; he appealed to all sides of the Chamber, as well as to the galleries—all were silent. At length, overcome with rage and vexation, he exclaimed, "President of Assassins! for the last time I demand a hearing!" But his voice had become hoarse; he foamed at the mouth, and finally sank down exhausted. His arrest was now decreed amid cries of *Vive la*

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 5; Durand de Maillane, *Hist. de la Convention*, ch. x.

[2] The Report was laid on the bar, and will be found in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. pp. 6-29. It accused, *by name*, only Collot d'Herbois and Billaud Varennes.

liberté! Vive la République! His brother Augustine demanded to share his fate. Couthon, St. Just, and Lebas were also ordered to be arrested.

When the news of the arrest of the five members reached the General Council of the *Commune*, which had assembled about six o'clock in the evening, they drew up a proclamation calling upon the people to rise, ordered the *tocsin* to be rung, the Sections to be convoked, and the cannoniers to repair to the Hôtel de Ville. The Jacobin Club also declared themselves in correspondence with the *Commune*. Henriot, who was half tipsy, had been arrested by two members of the Convention; Coffinhal and Louvet were therefore sent in his place to liberate the prisoners. They brought Robespierre to the Town Hall about nine o'clock in the evening. By orders from the *Commune* the *concierge* of the Luxembourg had refuse to receive him, and he had therefore gone to the Bureau of Police, with the view, apparently, of obtaining a trial before the Revolutionary Tribunal; and, as he hoped, a triumphant acquittal, like Marat. The other prisoners were also successively brought to the Town Hall. Meanwhile the Convention had resumed its sitting, and Henriot, who had also been liberated by Louvet and Coffinhal, had proceeded thither with his *état-major* and some cannoniers, with the intention of shutting up the Chamber. On his arrival, the President, putting on his hat in sign of distress, exclaimed, "The moment is come when we must die at our posts!" The deputies responded with cries of approbation, the spectators showed the same enthusiasm, and rushed out crying "To arms! let us repulse these wretches!" Henriot, having in vain exhorted the cannoniers to fire, took fright and returned at full gallop to the Hôtel de Ville. The Assembly now proceeded to outlaw him, as well as the five arrested members, and all functionaries who should take part against the Convention.[1]

It soon became evident that the tide of public opinion had turned. At the summons of the *Commune* the Sections had assembled about nine o'clock in the evening, and the insurgents had desired them to march their battalions to the Hôtel de Ville. But they were in a state of uncertainty; only some vague accounts had reached them of a quarrel between the Convention and the *Commune*, and therefore for the most part they sent but a few men to the Hôtel de Ville; while, on the arrival of a summons from the Convention, their battalions proceeded thither, defiled

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 69.

through the hall, and swore to protect the Assembly. As the Sections of the faubourgs St. Antoine and St. Marceau alone showed any willingness to respond to the appeal of the *Commune*, the Convention found itself strong enough to begin the attack. Barras and Fréron were despatched before midnight with two columns against the Hôtel de Ville; while a sufficient guard, with artillery, was left to protect the Assembly. Meanwhile, at the Hôtel de Ville, the Council of the *Commune*, with Robespierre and the other outlawed deputies, were sitting in conclave. An insurrection was debated. Robespierre was at first irresolute; but as the night wore on, and no other hope appeared, he reluctantly consented to a rising. In conjunction with St. Just, he signed a letter to Couthon, who had not yet arrived, inviting him to come and aid the insurrection, as well as a proclamation to the same purpose, addressed to his own section of the *Piques;* but such was his agitation, that to the latter he only affixed the first two letters of his name.[1]

The case did not seem altogether desperate. The Place de Grève was filled with armed men and cannons; the aid of the Sections was confidently anticipated, from their having sent deputations. But soon after midnight rumours began to arrive of their defection; emissaries from the advanced guard of the Conventional forces began to penetrate among the armed masses in front of the Hôtel de Ville, and raised the cry of *Vive la Convention!* which was answered by several voices; the proclamation of outlawry was read, on which the crowd dispersed. When Henriot descended, he found that all his troops and cannoniers had vanished. At the same time the heads of Barras and Fréron's columns were beginning to appear; presently they surrounded the Hôtel de Ville, with loud shouts of *Vive la Convention Nationale!* Some of them penetrated into the Council Chamber, when a strange sight presented itself. The elder Robespierre was seen, his jaw broken by a pistol-bullet;[2] Lebas had blown out his brains; Augustine Robespierre had thrown himself out of window, but survived the fall; Couthon had contrived to escape from the Council Chamber, but was seized by the mob and nearly thrown into the Seine; Coffinhal, accusing Henriot of cowardice, had thrown him out of window into a drain; he himself succeeded in escaping and concealed himself two or three days in an island in the Seine, but was ultimately captured;

[1] Blanc, t. xi. p. 251 sqq.

[2] It is doubtful whether he had attempted to commit suicide, or whether he was shot by Méda, a *gendarme;* but, on the whole, the former seems the more probable account.

St. Just alone awaited his fate with tranquillity. Robespierre was conveyed to the apartments of the Committee of Public Welfare, where, stretched on a table, wounded and dejected, his countenance bloody and disfigured, he was exposed to the gaze and maledictions of the spectators. His former colleagues came to insult him, struck him, spat in his face; the clerks of the bureau pricked him with their penknives.[1] In the course of the forenoon he was transferred to the *Conciergerie*, and thence brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal, together with his accomplices. After their identity had been proved, they were sent to the scaffold, about five o'clock in the evening of 10th *Thermidor*.

The *guillotine* had on this occasion been replaced in the Place de la Révolution. The windows along the line of streets through which the procession was to pass had been hired at large sums, and were mostly filled by well-dressed women. Robespierre was placed in a cart between Henriot and Couthon, who were also mutilated. The *gendarmes* pointed him out with their swords to the mob, who shouted *A mort le tyran!* His jaw was wrapped in a bloody cloth; his face already bore the lividness of death. Of the twenty-one persons that were executed with him, Robespierre mounted the scaffold last. He uttered a piercing shriek when the executioner tore the bandage from his neck. The fall of his head was hailed by the crowd with shouts of applause.

Robespierre had few or none of the qualities which are commonly supposed to characterize the leaders of great revolutions. He had neither commanding ability, nor personal courage, nor the popular manners and address which conciliate friends and partisans; his person was small and mean, his voice shrill and disagreeable, his countenance repulsive, his habits selfish and egotistical in the extreme. He had none of the coarseness that marked the period. He dressed himself with scrupulous neatness; continued to wear hair-powder, though the disuse of it was a distinctive mark of Jacobinism; abhorred the *bonnet rouge* and the slang of the Revolution. He had the profoundest sense of his own talents, and of his own virtue. His image was displayed in every kind of art in his apartments. To what then must be attributed the influence of such a man in those turbulent times? First, he seemed to be the living image of Rousseau's sentimentality, which played so great a part in the Revolution. His discourses were made up of commonplaces from Rousseau about the rights of man

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 94.

and the sovereignty of the people, which he continuously and monotonously repeated, without adding a single new idea of his own.[1] But amidst these commonplaces there was always a particular passage of sentiment and pathos respecting himself, his merits, the labours of his painful career, his personal sufferings. These appeals, which were aided by his pale and melancholy visage, had a great effect, especially upon the women, and came so regularly that the pocket-handkerchiefs were got ready beforehand.[2] By dint of labour he had acquired a style which bore some distant resemblance to Rousseau's. He was not covetous of money, and it is said that at his lodgings were found only an *assignat* of fifty livres, and some orders of the Constituent Assembly for his pay as deputy, which he had not used.[3] His passion was not avarice but ambition, springing from boundless egotism and pride. His cautiousness, cunning, and perseverance were among the chief means of his success. He had the art to destroy his opponents without exposing himself, by setting them against one another, and then withdrawing from the scene of danger. But there was one point of his character which fully identified him with the spirit of the Revolution. He had no compunction in sacrificing human life to any extent. In his case, however, this does not appear to have arisen, as with Collot d'Herbois, Fouché, Carrier, and other monsters of the period, from a mere savage thirst for human blood, but because he thought such a course a necessary means for carrying out his fanatical policy.

With the death of Robespierre the Reign of Terror may be said to have ended. From the first establishment of the Revolutionary Tribunal, down to the 9th *Thermidor*, between 2,000 and 3,000 persons had perished by the *guillotine* in Paris.[4] More than a third of these victims were persons belonging to the lower classes, such as workmen, soldiers, sempstresses, and women servants. Bailleul, who was seven months in the *Conciergerie*, says that almost all the persons who perished under his eyes belonged to the class of citizens, and even smaller citizens. There were among them domestic servants, cobblers, and even a nightman![5] During this period the public executioner was accustomed to apply daily to the Revolutionary Tribunal, to know how many carts would be required. But the Reign of Terror was not only dreadful through these executions, it also interfered tyrannically in all the affairs of

[1] Garat, in *Hist. Parl.* t. xviii. p. 333.
[2] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. liv. vi. ch. vi.
[3] Blanc, t. xi. p. 263.
[4] According to the *Hist. Parl.* (t. xxxiv. p. 97) 2669. Cf. Croker, *Essays*, p. 449.
[5] *Examen, &c.* t. ii. p. 216.

life. The journals were subjected to a censorship; letters were officially and publicly opened at the post-office; the taxes were unjustly levied; requisitions for money, horses, and other articles were arbitrarily, and often fraudulently, made by the public officers under terror of the *guillotine*.[1] Nobody, not even the Treasury, could tell the sums levied. To be rich was often a cause of accusation, and always a certain ground of condemnation. Cambon, the Finance Minister, used to call this "coining money on the Place de la Révolution with the balance of the *guillotine*."[2]

It has been thought that if the *coup d'état* of the 9th *Thermidor* had been favourable to Robespierre, the French Republic would have terminated with him instead of Napoleon, and that, once in possession of supreme power, he would have used it with moderation. We must confess our opinion that though he had the art to supplant his enemies, he had neither the genius nor the courage which would have enabled him for any considerable time to have been the ruler and dictator of a great nation. The facility with which his overthrow was effected shows that his influence was already on the wane; and it seems probable that nothing but a military despotism could have rescued France from the anarchy into which she had fallen.

[1] See Robespierre's *Papers*, No. 38, and *Corr. inédite du Comité de Salut Public*, ap. Granier de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 614 sq.

[2] Barère, *Mém.* t. ii. p. 129.

CHAPTER LVII.

WE must now direct our view to the general affairs of Europe; among which the state of Poland, to which we have alluded in the preceding chapter,[1] first claims our attention.

The first partition of Poland and the Constitution of 1775, guaranteed by Russia,[2] had placed it at the mercy of that Power, more especially by means of the Permanent Council, composed of Russian partisans, and directed by the Russian ambassador. King Stanislaus Poniatowski himself was the mere creature of the Empress Catharine II., and had disgusted the Poles by the subserviency which he displayed towards her and Potemkin. Poland, in short, was administered almost as if it already formed a Russian province. Rumours were afloat of a fresh partition, which should reduce it in reality to that condition, when the breaking out of the war between Russia and the Porte, in 1787, seemed to offer an opportunity for throwing off the Russian yoke. The patriot party, led by Ignatius and Stanislaus Potocki, Kollontay, Kosciuszko, Malachowski, and others, determined to embrace it.

Catharine II., desirous that the Poles should assist her in her war against the Turks, proposed an alliance for that purpose to Stanislaus Augustus and the Permanent Council. Such an alliance, however, was contrary to ancient treaties subsisting between Poland and the Porte; and King Stanislaus, however willing to assist his mistress, was unable to do so without appealing to the constitutional, or four-years' diet, which was to meet in October, 1788. As we have related in a former chapter,[3] a complete change had now been effected in the political aspect of Europe through the triple alliance between Great Britain, the United Provinces, and Prussia, with a view to oppose the designs of Russia and Austria; and the Polish patriots, reckoning on the

[1] *Supra*, p. 466. See for the affairs of Poland, Ferrand, *Hist. des trois démembrements de la Pologne;* Oginski, *Mém. sur la Pologne et les Polonais* depuis 1788 *jusqu'à* 1815 (a work marked by candour and good feeling); Jekel, *Polens Staatsveränderungen;* Ségur, *Règne de Fred. Guillaume II.* t. iii. ch. 12; K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. iv. Kap. 28; Castéra, *Vie de Cathérine II.* sub fin.

[2] See vol. iii. p. 215.

[3] See above, p. 230.

aid of Prussia and her allies, resolved to make a stand for liberty. Great efforts were made by men of talent and energy to be elected as nuncios to an Assembly which, it was believed, would alter and fix the destinies of their country. Their first triumph was to convert the Diet, the day after it met, into a Confederation, thus obviating the *liberum veto*, and leaving matters to be decided by a majority of votes. A note presented to the Diet by Count Bucholtz, the Prussian Minister, October 12th, strongly protesting, in the name of his master, against the alliance proposed by Russia,[1] inspired the patriots with unbounded confidence, especially as the Prussian Cabinet appeared resolved to support its policy by arms; and the Russian ambassador found himself compelled to withdraw his proposal of an alliance. It must be remembered, therefore, as an important element in weighing the subsequent conduct of the King of Prussia towards the Poles, that it was he who first sought their friendship, and by promises and professions encouraged them to expose themselves to all the dangers of a rupture with Russia. Nor did he stop here. He approved the projects of the Poles for reforming their Constitution, and liberating themselves from Russian influence. These projects were invariably communicated to the Prussian Minister, and to Hailes, the English resident at Warsaw; and when the Russian Minister notified that the Empress would regard the slightest change made in the Constitution of 1775 as a violation of treaties, the Prussian Cabinet declared, in a note of November 19th, that no previous guarantee could prevent the Poles from improving their Constitution.

Thus encouraged, the Diet, in spite of the threats of Russia, abolished the Permanent Council, January 18th, 1789, increased the army, and instituted a Council of War, independent of the King. But further reforms were too long delayed. It is probable that if the Constitution of May 3rd, 1791, had been established a year or two earlier, before the union of Prussia and Russia, with regard to the affairs of France, had altered all Frederick William's views as to Poland, she would not have lost the Prussian alliance, and that her liberties might have been saved. There was, however, another condition necessary to secure the continued friendship of Prussia. That Power had long coveted the possession of Dantzic and Thorn. In April, 1789, the Marquis Lucchesini was sent to Warsaw to negotiate for the cession of those places, with instructions to denounce as an imposture the idea that Frederick

[1] *Mém.* Oginski, t. i. p. 35 sqq.

William desired a fresh partition of Poland; to assert that he sought only the glory of delivering Europe from the ambition of the barbarians of the North, and of restoring Poland to her former position and liberty. Certain compensations were to be offered to the Poles, and especially an advantageous treaty of commerce with Prussia, England, and Holland. Several of the patriot party were of opinion that the cession should be made.[1] It was advocated by the English Ministry, though not by the merchants of England; and probably it might have secured the Prussian alliance, and have deprived that country of any motive for a second partition of Poland. But it was opposed by a numerous party in the Diet, and especially by those who were in the interest of Russia. Prussia, in consequence, abandoned the project for the present, but she still kept her eyes fixed in that direction. Meanwhile, as a war with Austria appeared imminent, Frederick William, towards the end of 1789, expressed his desire of forming an intimate connection with the Poles; and urged them to fix, as soon as possible, their form of government. In January, 1790, the Prussian Minister signified that his Court approved of all the reforms hitherto adopted by the Diet; proposed a defensive alliance, coupled with a reduction of duties on Polish commodities; and though he concealed not how much the cession of Thorn and Dantzic was desired, he did not insist upon that point, and all mention of it was omitted in the defensive treaty concluded at Warsaw, March 29th. In the treaty concluded between Prussia and the Ottoman Porte in the previous January, it had been agreed that Galicia, which had fallen to the share of Austria in the first partition of Poland in 1772, should be wrested from her; and the Cabinet of Berlin was inclined to restore this province, or, at all events, a part of it, containing the salt works of Wieliczka, to the Poles, as an equivalent for the cession of Dantzic and Thorn. But, as we have said, the majority of the Diet were averse to cede those ports, especially Dantzic, the key of the Vistula, and the subject was therefore dropped.[2] The sixth article of the Treaty of Warsaw is the most important, as having direct reference to Russia.[3] It purported that if any foreign Power whatever, in consequence of preceding acts and stipulations, should assume the right of meddling in the internal affairs of the Polish Republic, his Prus-

[1] *Mém.* Oginski, t. i. p. 34.

[2] The correspondence between the Kings of Prussia and Poland on this subject will be found in Herzberg, *Recueil*, t. iii. p. 12 sqq. and in Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 125 sqq. (2nd ed.).

[3] See Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xiv. p. 119. The treaty is in Martens, *Recueil*, t. iv. p. 471.

sian Majesty would first employ his good offices to prevent any hostilities that might arise from such a pretension; and that if these should fail, and Poland should be attacked, he would consider himself bound to afford the assistance stipulated in the present treaty, by which it was agreed that Prussia should furnish 30,000 men.

Meanwhile the framing of the new Constitution was proceeding very slowly. The ill success of the Poles in their attempts to establish their independence must in a great measure be ascribed to themselves. Some of the magnates had sold themselves unreservedly to the enemies of their country; others, who played the double game of patriots, were still more dangerous to her. Amongst the former were Branicki, the Crown General, who had married a niece of Potemkin's, and Count Rzewuski; among the latter, the most conspicuous was Felix Potocki, Marshal of Lithuania; but the King himself was included in this category. Potocki affected liberal principles, and, in common with Prince Adam Czartoryski, Malachowski, Marshal of the Diet, and many other nobles, had caused himself to be admitted a citizen of Warsaw. At length the new Constitution was promulgated May 3rd, 1791.[1] The principal articles of it were, that the Roman Catholic faith should be the religion of the State, though dissenters were allowed the exercise of their worship, and full participation in all civil rights; the *liberum veto* was abolished; and, what was most important of all, the Crown was declared hereditary. The discussion of this article had been attended with great difficulties. To many of the Poles, to abandon the right of election seemed to be to sacrifice their liberties, especially as every noble might aspire to the Throne. The succession was settled, upon the death of King Stanislaus, upon Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, and, in the event of his decease without male issue, on the husband whom he might select for his daughter, with the consent of the States. Should the reigning House become extinct, then the elective right was to revert to the nation. The Elector of Saxony, however, was far from being dazzled with the splendid but precarious offer of the Polish Crown. He replied evasively, and delayed a definitive answer till April, 1792; when he gave a conditional assent, dependent on the approval of the neighbouring Courts, and on certain changes to be made in the Constitution.[2] The Constitution of May 3rd, and especially the article respecting

[1] A *résumé* of it will be found in Koch and Schöll, t. xiv. p. 125, and in Oginski, *Mém.* t. i. p. 130 sqq.

[2] Oginski, *ibid.* p 140.

the hereditary succession of the Crown, was far from being popular. This article was carried in the Diet only by a small majority, while of sixty *Dietines* or provincial Diets, only ten adopted it.[1] Yet the elective right had mainly contributed to nourish anarchy in Poland, and to afford the neighbouring Powers a pretence for interfering in its affairs. The Russian party, by way of thwarting the designs of Prussia on Dantzic and Thorn, had contrived to obtain the insertion of an article prohibiting, under any circumstance, the transfer of any portion of the territory or sovereign rights of Poland to a foreign Power. The Prussian Cabinet was much opposed to the new Polish Constitution. They dreaded that, as the Kingdom was to become hereditary, it might, by a marriage with the Elector's daughter, fall into the hands of a Russian or Austrian Prince, or of a small German Prince entirely dependent on Austria or Russia. But Frederick William at that time dreaded a breach with Russia, and was therefore desirous of conciliating the Poles; and he consequently both directly,[2] and through his Ambassador, Lucchesini, announced, both at Warsaw and Dresden, his satisfaction at the happy revolution which had been accomplished. These, however, as appeared from the result, were mere perfidious compliments, on which the Poles laid too much stress.

The Empress Catharine II., on the other hand, viewed the proceedings of the Poles with a displeasure which she did not attempt to conceal. Although the new Constitution substituted an hereditary for an elective monarchy, and maintained the nobility and their privileges, yet the patriot nobles, by their liberal measures, and especially by demanding the citizenship of Warsaw, seemed to adopt the doctrine of equality; and Catharine pretended to recognize in the enthusiasm and effervescence which reigned in Poland, the germ of those principles which agitated France, and menaced every throne in Europe. The altered state of things at the commencement of 1792 enabled her to wreak her vengeance on the unhappy Poles. The Courts of Berlin and Vienna were now reconciled, and jointly occupied in the war against France, while the Peace of Jassy, between Russia and the Turks, to which the English and Dutch had acceded, enabled Catharine to dispose freely of her forces. Her first plan was to occupy Poland without a participator; but from this she was

[1] Essen's *Bericht*, ap. Hermann; *Gesch. Russlands*, B. vi. S. 354 ff.

[2] See his letter to Count Golt, in Ségur, *Règne de Fr. Guillaume II.* t. iii. *Pièces Justif.* p. 252; and that to Stanislaus, May 23rd, ap. Oginski, t. i. p. 140. Cf. Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, vol. i. p. 340 sq. (Eng. transl.)

deterred by the good understanding between Austria and Prussia. It was necessary, therefore, to conciliate those Powers, as well as to offer them some allurement for the prosecution of the French war, which interested her much, though she took no part in it. Both the German Powers wanted compensation for their risks and expenses in the war against France; Prussia desired a Polish province, and the imagination of the Austrian Emperor Francis II. was inflamed by Catharine's suggestion of an exchange of Belgium for some Bavarian territory.[1] It was not difficult for Catharine to get up a strong party in Poland itself, where she had already numerous adherents, and where many of the grandees were disgusted at being excluded by the new Constitution from all chance of the throne. Among these last the principal were Felix Potocki, Severin Rzewuski, and Branicki, the Crown General. These nobles were invited to St. Petersburg, and formed with the Russian Cabinet a conspiracy for the overthrow of the Polish Constitution. King Stanislaus, the slave of Catharine, lent himself to the same design. All the projected reforms were delayed; the public offices were filled with the open or secret adherents of Russia; Branicki was appointed Minister at War, and all preparations for defence were neglected.[2]

The result of these plots was manifested by the CONFEDERATION OF TARGOWITZ, May, 1792, formed with the avowed object of restoring what may be called the Russian Constitution of 1775. About the same time Catharine published a sort of manifesto, in which she declared the new Constitution illegal and dangerous, and intimated to the Poles that they must return to their ancient laws, or she would constrain them by force. The manifest of the Confederation had also been prepared at St. Petersburg, and Potocki, Branicki, and Rzewuski only returned into Poland with the Russian troops. The majority of the Poles, however, still continued to retain their confidence in King Stanislaus and in the King of Prussia. The Diet, after publishing a Declaration in answer to that of Russia, and declaring their intention to defend their rights, adjourned themselves, May 30th, for an indefinite period, and thus put themselves in the power of Stanislaus and his ministry. Stanislaus for a while kept up appearances, and he addressed a letter to Frederick William II. calling on him for the aid stipulated by the Treaty of Warsaw (May 31st). The Prussian King, in his answer (June 8th), stated what was true

[1] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, Book vi. ch. 2.
[2] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 384.

enough as to his private sentiments, but not, as we have seen, as to his public acts, that he had never approved of the new Constitution, though he had done nothing to hinder it; that, but for this Constitution, and the measures taken to uphold it, Russia would never have resorted to coercive measures; that, whatever his friendship for Stanislaus, the state of things had completely altered since the defensive alliance was made; that the present conjuncture, having arisen since the Constitution of May 3rd, could not be brought under the obligations of the Treaty of Warsaw; that consequently he was not bound to oppose the present attacks of Russia, so long as the patriotic party persisted in their views; but if this party would reconsider them, he would unite with Russia and Austria in endeavouring to conciliate matters.

It is true enough that the French declaration of war against Austria, and the alliance of Prussia with the latter Power, had made a great alteration in the state of things, though hardly enough to release Frederick William from his solemn obligations. It has been alleged in his defence that he was alarmed at the resemblance between some of the speeches made in the Diet and those of the French revolutionists; and that to carry on a war with Russia and France at the same time was an absolute impossibility.[1] We have, however, before had occasion to remark,[2] that the war with France was little more than a screen and pretence for Prussia's selfish designs upon Poland. In fact, months before Catharine had avowed her designs, and when the war between Austria and France, though imminent, was not yet declared, the Cabinets of Berlin and St. Petersburg had already come to an understanding upon the affairs of Poland; and Catharine, as we have already said, had offered Frederick William a share in the second partition of that country, provided that, in conjunction with Austria, he should consent to march against France.[3]

King Stanislaus issued a proclamation, July 4th, calling on the Poles to defend their independence, and asserting that he was resolved to share their fortunes. Yet, instead of proceeding to the camp, he remained at Warsaw, though the Russian army, 100,000 strong, had entered Poland in May. He had, indeed, already entered into a secret understanding with Russia; and had

[1] See Menzel, *loc. cit.* [2] *Supra*, p. 387.

[3] See the Duke of Brunswick's *Letter* to Bischofswerder, February 19th, 1792, and Hardenberg's remarks upon it, *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 353 sq.

written a letter to the Empress proposing to her Prince Constantine as his successor, imploring her to take a compassionate view of his situation. He had also prevented the Polish army, of which his nephew Joseph Poniatowski was commander-in-chief, from undertaking anything important, had in fact forbidden his nephew to venture upon a battle. Yet the Poles had proved in several skirmishes that they had not degenerated from their ancient valour. In these affairs, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who had received his military education in France, and completed it under Gates and Washington in the American war of liberation, distinguished himself by his valour and conduct. His exploit at Dubienka, July 17th, where, with 4,000 Poles, he had maintained his post against the efforts of 18,000 Russians, showed what might have been accomplished by courage and resolution. Yet a few days after (July 23rd) Stanislaus acceded to the Confederation of Targowitz. Catharine had directed him to do so in her reply to his letter, as the sole condition on which she could continue to call herself his sister and friendly neighbour. Felix Potocki was proclaimed Marshal of the Confederation, August 2nd, which was now called the "Confederation of the Crown;" an armistice was concluded, the command of the Polish army was restored to the ancient generals, the troops assembled near Warsaw were dismissed, and the Russians occupied Praga, a suburb of that city. The confederates of Targowitz being now masters of the Government, appointed an executive Commission of six, who assumed the sovereign power, and left the King not a shadow of authority.

The Prussians were now to play their part. A treaty for the partition of Poland had been signed between the Cabinets of Berlin and St. Petersburg, January 4th, 1793, and soon after a Prussian army occupied Great Poland. On January 16th, Prussia published a Declaration stating that the grounds for this step were, the disturbances that had arisen in Poland in consequence of the new Constitution, established without consulting neighbouring Powers; the secret agitations still kept up, to the danger of the public peace; and especially the propagation of French principles in Poland, which excited in the King of Prussia apprehensions for the safety of his own dominions. Under these circumstances, being about to undertake another campaign, he had come to an agreement with the Courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg that it would be impolitic to leave an enemy behind him; and it only remained for the well-disposed inhabitants to deserve

his protection by their quiet behaviour.[1] This was followed by another Declaration, directed against Dantzic, February 24th, and charging the inhabitants with having displayed for a long series of years, an unfriendly feeling towards Prussia, harbouring the dangerous sect of Jacobins, supplying the enemy with provisions, &c. Nothing could be more unfounded than these charges against the Poles of entertaining French revolutionary principles. So far from there being any Jacobin clubs in Poland, her most distinguished orators denounced the French levellers, who in turn abused the Poles, and ridiculed their new Constitution. Prussia was in every sense of the word the aggressor, without the shadow of a legal pretext.[2] The Council and citizens of Dantzic offered to surrender, on condition that their ancient constitution should be preserved, and that the fortifications of the town should remain in possession of the municipality, and be garrisoned by their troops. These terms were refused, Dantzic was blockaded by General Von Raumer, March 8th, the outworks were gradually taken, and on April 8th it opened its gates.

Frederick William had published a patent on the 25th of March, announcing to the States and inhabitants of the Palatinates of Posen, Gnesen, Kalisch, Siradia, Lentschitz, Rawa, Plotzk, the town and convent of Czenstochowa, the districts Wielun, Cujavia, Dobrzyn, the towns of Dantzic and Thorn, that they were henceforth to consider themselves Prussian subjects. They were invited to assemble as soon as possible in a Diet, in order to settle these matters in an amicable manner. But, without waiting for its decision, they were to regard Frederick William as their Sovereign, and to present themselves to do homage to him. A proclamation of the Russian general, of a similar tenor, appeared April 7th, announcing that he took possession for the Empress of the counties of Poloczk, Vilna, Novogrodek, Brzesc, the greater part of Volhynia, of what remained of Podolia, and of the Palatinates of Kiew and Bracklaw. The provinces now seized by Frederick William were put on the same footing with those previously acquired, and received the name of *South Prussia*. Homage was done to that Sovereign at Posen, May 3rd.

The Diet of Grodno, which was to sanction the cessions to the two Powers, assembled June 17th, 1793. The Permanent Council

[1] *Politisches Journal*, January, 1793, ap. Menzel, B. iv. S. 394. Cf. *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 193.

[2] Ségur, *Règne de Fr. Guillaume II.* t. iii. p. 152 note; Oginski, *Mém.* t. i. p. 226; Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, ii. p. 420 (Eng. transl.).

had been previously re-established at the instance, or rather by the threats, of Sievers, the Russian ambassador. The Diet exhibited the greatest reluctance to enter into the treaties demanded by Russia and Prussia for the dismemberment of Poland; and they appealed against them, but of course without effect, to all the Courts with which the Republic was connected. Finding themselves at length compelled to submit, they endeavoured to make a separate treaty with Russia, in the hope that Catharine would defend them against the claims of Frederick William; and some authors have asserted that the Russian Empress made them a promise to that effect, although the two Courts had declared that they would treat only jointly.[1] However this may be, the Diet could at first be brought only to appoint a deputation to treat with Russia. The treaty with that Power, signed July 13th, and ratified by the Diet, August 17th,[2] transferred to Russia the provinces already named, comprising a surface of 4,553 geographical square miles, and a population of more than three million souls.

The Diet, after the arrangement of this treaty, with a credulity which seems to have marked the Polish character, requested Sievers to engage the mediation of his Sovereign with Frederick William, in order to induce him to restore the provinces which he had occupied, and to indemnify the Republic for the wrongs and losses which that act had occasioned! But Sievers insisted that they should appoint a deputation to treat with the Prussian Minister; and, after a violent debate, the votes being equally balanced, Stanislaus Augustus turned the scale in favour of Prussia, in the hope, apparently, of saving some small remnant of his dominions. But the members of the Diet, as if by common consent, remained obstinately silent, although Sievers caused several of them to be arrested by his Cossacks, and surrounded the chamber with troops and cannon. In this state of things, Count Bialinski, Marshal of the Diet, a devoted partisan of Russia, having thrice demanded whether the Assembly authorized the deputation to sign the treaty with the King of Prussia, and receiving no answer, interpreted the silence as consent, and directed the deputation to conclude.

The Treaty of Grodno with Prussia was signed September 25th, 1793.[3] The provinces before enumerated, provisionally seized by Frederick William II., were ceded to that Sovereign. They con-

[1] Ségur, *loc. cit.* [2] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 530.
[3] Martens, *ibid.* p. 544.

tained 1,061 square miles of territory, peopled by more than three and a half million souls.

The Confederation of Targowitz having fulfilled its purpose, Catharine caused it to be annulled, and the old Constitution was nominally restored, September 15th. The Prussian treaty was almost immediately followed by a treaty of alliance between the Polish Republic and the Empress Catharine, October 16th.[1] This convention, under the names of an indissoluble union and defensive alliance, virtually rendered the Poles subject to Russia. The King and Republic of Poland engaged to leave the direction of military and political matters to the Empress and her successors; her troops were to have free entry into Poland; and the Republic were to conclude no treaties with foreign Powers, nor even to negotiate with them, except in concert with Russia.

Among the last acts of the Diet of Grodno were a revision of the Constitution, the restoration of the King to the prerogatives of which he had been deprived by the Confederation of Targowitz, and the readjustment of what remained of Poland into eleven Palatinates, eight in Poland and three in Lithuania. It separated November 24th, after annulling all the acts of the Confederation of Targowitz, and thus, among other things, re-establishing a military order for those who should distinguish themselves in a war against Russia! For suffering these decrees to pass, through inadvertence, Sievers was superseded in the Russian embassy by General Igelström, a man of still more violent character. Igelström compelled the King and Permanent Council to cancel the Decrees by what was called a *Universal*, January 10th, 1794.

After the disastrous campaign of 1792 several of the Polish patriots, as Kollentay, Ignatius Potocki, Kosciuszko, and others, had retired into Saxony. But they were still animated with the hope of rescuing their country from oppression; and it was not long before an arbitrary act of the Russian ambassador seemed to offer an opportunity for accomplishing their purpose. Igelström had directed the Permanent Council to reduce the Polish army to 15,000 men. This measure, besides wounding the national feelings, was unjust in a pecuniary point of view. Many officers had purchased their posts, and depended on them for subsistence; some were in advance for the pay of the soldiers, others had enlisted them at their own expense. This offence was given at a moment when the national feeling was already in a state of fer-

[1] Martens, *ibid.* p. 536.

mentation. Much excitement and turbulence had been displayed in the *Dietines* assembled in February, 1794, for the elections under the new Constitution. The symptoms were so alarming that Igelström deemed it necessary to form a Russian camp near Warsaw, to retain that city in obedience. The insurrection of 1794 was commenced by Madalinski, a general of brigade, stationed at Pultusk, about eight leagues from Warsaw. Madalinski, having been ordered to reform his corps according to the new regulations, refused to do so till they had received their pay, which was two months in arrear; and he marched towards Cracow, skirting the provinces recently annexed to Prussia. Kosciuszko, who was at Dresden, hearing of this movement, hastened to Cracow, where he was proclaimed generalissimo, March 24th, 1794. The Russian garrison of that place had marched against Madalinski. Kosciuszko, having assembled the citizens, proclaimed the Constitution of May 3rd, 1791, amidst the greatest enthusiasm. He also issued a proclamation, calling on the whole nation to assert their independence, and employed himself in organizing his little army, to which he added a number of peasants armed with scythes. With these tumultuary forces he attacked and defeated a body of 7,000 Russians at Raslawice, April 4th; an affair, indeed, of no great importance, but which encouraged the troops with hopes of further victories.

The King and Permanent Council, in a *Universal* published April 11th, declared the leaders of the insurrection rebels and traitors, ordered them to be brought to trial, exhorted the Poles to obedience, warned them by the example of France of the dangers of rebellion. To this, however, little heed was given. The forces of Kosciuszko increased daily, and Igelström, distrusting the garrison of Warsaw, first occupied the castle and other posts with Russian soldiers; subsequently, being compelled to weaken his troops there by detaching some of them against the insurgents, he resolved to disarm the Polish garrison. But this scheme got wind, and the insurrectionary leaders resolved to anticipate it. On the night of April 16th, the Polish garrison and the citizens of Warsaw flew to arms and massacred the Russians wherever they were found in small numbers. A bloody fight ensued in the streets, the Russians retreating from one quarter to another, till at last, after a resistance of thirty-six hours, which cost the Russians more than 4,000 men, killed, wounded, or made prisoners, Igelström, with the remainder of his troops, succeeded in escaping from the town, and took refuge in the Prussian camp in the

vicinity.[1] The citizens of Warsaw now signed the new Confederation, and recognized Kosciuszko as their commander-in-chief; King Stanislaus was deprived of his authority, but treated with the respect due to his rank.

The news of this insurrection was the signal for a rising in Lithuania. The citizens of Vilna flew to arms on the night of April 23rd, and massacred or made prisoners nearly all the Russian garrison. A similar scene took place at Grodno. A criminal tribunal erected at Vilna condemned to death the Bishop Kossakowski, a partisan of Russia. The insurrection now spread rapidly through all the Palatinates. The entire Polish army declared for Kosciuszko; the regiments which had entered the Russian service deserted *en masse*, and ranged themselves under his colours. An ordinance, published at the camp of Polanice, May 10th, 1794, established a National or Supreme Council of eight members for the government of the Republic. The King was entirely set aside, though suffered to retain his title. Kosciuszko himself had been invested with dictatorial power, which he employed only for the good of his country.

Colonel Manstein now persuaded Frederick William II. to enter Poland with his army, neglecting the campaign on the Rhine; and, though Count Haugwitz and Marshal Möllendorf protested against so open a breach of the treaty recently concluded with England and Holland at the Hague, it was decided that, in the French war,[2] Prussia should do only what was absolutely unavoidable. The Prussian troops invaded Poland in various quarters, and on June 3rd, the King himself entered the territory of Cracow with reinforcements, intending to form a junction with a Russian corps under General Denisoff. Kosciuszko, to prevent this, attacked Denisoff at Szczekociny, June 6th. He was not aware that the Prussians were so near at hand till they fell upon his left wing, and by their superior numbers compelled him to retreat with considerable loss. He now withdrew to Gora, a town about ten leagues from Warsaw, where he entrenched himself. In order to animate the Poles, the Supreme Council published a declaration of war against Prussia, June 12th, signed by Ignatius Potocki. On the 15th Cracow surrendered to a Prussian corps; an event which induced the Emperor Francis II. to declare himself. A change had taken place in the counsels of the Court of Vienna, now directed by Thugut. Early in June, Francis re-

[1] The Poles lost only 356 men killed and wounded. Von Sybel, vol. iii. p. 391 (Eng. Tr.). [2] Von Sybel, iii. 399 sq. (Eng. Tr.).

solved to abandon his Belgian provinces, and to seek compensation in Bavaria and Poland.[1] Catharine had invited him to intervene in the affairs of Poland by way of counterpoise to Prussia, whose ambitious designs she was desirous of limiting.[2] Having quitted his army, and returned to Vienna, he directed General D'Arnoncourt to announce by a proclamation, June 30th, that to avert the danger arising to the Province of Galicia from the disturbances in Poland, he had been ordered to enter that country with his forces.[3] A *corps d'armée* of 17,000 Austrians accordingly marched on Brzesc and Dubnow.

Kosciuszko had retired from Gora to Warsaw. That city was unfortified, and Kosciuszko covered it on its western side by an entrenched camp. He had been followed by Frederick William, who took up a position at Vola, about a league from Warsaw. From his camp at this place he addressed a letter to King Stanislaus, August 2nd, demanding the surrender of Warsaw, threatening it with military execution if taken by assault. Stanislaus, who had, in fact, no authority in the matter, replied, that as Kosciuszko's army lay between the town and the Prussians, he had no power to order its surrender; and he deprecated Frederick William's threats of cruelty and vengeance, as contrary to the example which kings owed to their people, and, as he sincerely thought, at variance with the King of Prussia's personal character.[4]

Many assaults had been delivered, Kosciuszko's entrenchments were falling gradually into the hands of the Prussians, and the capture of Warsaw appeared imminent, when Frederick William, to the surprise of the Poles, suddenly departed with precipitation, leaving behind his sick and wounded, and a large part of his baggage (September 6th). The reason for Frederick William's retreat was the breaking out of an insurrection in the provinces recently annexed to Prussia. The Prussian yoke was much more intolerable to the Poles than the Russian. All civil employments in the subjugated provinces were filled by Germans; the inhabitants were subject to a civil and criminal code, published in German, and were constrained to learn that tongue. The withdrawal of the Prussian troops for the siege of Warsaw affording an opportunity, an insurrection broke out in Siradia, August 23rd, and soon spread to the other provinces of Great Poland. The towns of

[1] See the next chapter, campaign of 1794.

[2] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 13.

[3] Oginski, *Mém.* t. i. p. 410.

[4] *Ibid.* t. ii. p. 3 sqq. *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 56.

Posen, Petrikau, and one or two others, having Prussian garrisons, were alone retained in obedience. Kosciuszko took advantage of the rebellion to despatch Dembrowski with a considerable corps into West Prussia. Dembrowski seized the town of Bromberg and the magazines collected there, and compelled the inhabitants to take an oath of fealty to the Polish Republic; an exploit which occasioned such alarm at Berlin that Prince Hohenlohe with his *corps* was recalled from the Rhine.

But this success was only partial and temporary. On other sides the prospects of the Poles began to lower. A Russian army under Knoring and Souboff had assembled in Lithuania, and as it advanced, that of the Poles melted away. The Lithuanians under General Chléwinski were entirely defeated August 12th, Vilna was compelled to open its gates, and the whole province was speedily recovered by the Russians. Early in September, Suvaroff, recalled from the Turkish frontiers, entered Volhynia with 20,000 men, and directed his march upon Warsaw. On the 18th he dislodged the Polish general Sierakowski, posted with 15,000 men at Krupczyce, near Brzesc, and defeated him next day on the banks of the Bug. The Poles lost 6,000 men and thirty guns on this bloody day. Suvaroff having formed a junction with Prince Repnin, who was marching on Warsaw from Grodno, Kosciuszko hastened to oppose them. At Maciejowice he met the corps of General Fersen, who was waiting for Repnin and Suvaroff, and immediately attacked him, October 10th. But the reinforcements which Kosciuszko expected did not arrive; the Russians, irritated by the carnage at Warsaw, fell with inexpressible fury upon the Poles, and made a terrible slaughter. As the fate of the day hung doubtful, Kosciuszko, with his principal officers and the *élite* of his cavalry, dashed into the thickest of the fight, when his horse having fallen with him, he was made prisoner.[1] He had received some severe wounds in the head and other parts, and was long insensible. On recovering his consciousness he is said to have uttered the words, *Finis Poloniæ!* On this fatal day, 3,000 more prisoners, including many distinguished officers, and all the artillery and baggage, fell into the hands of the Russians; the field of battle was strewed with the bodies of 6,000 Poles.

The news of the disaster struck Warsaw with consternation. Nevertheless the revolutionary leaders resolved not to abandon

[1] Kosciuszko was liberated on the accession of the Emperor Paul. After passing some time in America and England, he established himself at Fontainebleau, and subsequently in Switzerland, where he died in 1817.

the national cause. The command-in-chief was confided to Wawrzecki, and Prince Poniatowski was directed to march to the aid of Dembrowski and Madalinski, who were returning from their expedition into Prussia. Poniatowski, by attacking the Prussians at Sochaczen, October 22nd, occasioned a diversion which enabled the two generals to effect their retreat to Warsaw.

De Favrat, the commander of the Prussian army, crossed the Vistula at Viszgorod, and surrounded Warsaw on the western side, while the Russians, under Derfelden and Fersen, invested the suburb of Praga, on the right bank of the Vistula. They were joined towards the end of October by Suvaroff. Praga, though defended by 100 guns, was assaulted and taken by the Russians, and being chiefly built of wood, was almost entirely destroyed by fire, November 4th. Of the Polish garrison, consisting of 26,000 men, 12,000 perished in the assault; 10,000 more were taken prisoners; of the remainder, who endeavoured to escape to Warsaw, 2,000 were drowned in the Vistula. The inhabitants of Praga, to the number of 12,000 of both sexes, including infants and aged persons, were massacred.[1] This terrible catastrophe, to which history offers but few parallels, filled Warsaw with consternation and despair. The magistrates were desirous of capitulating, but the troops would not hear of it. At length the National Council and General Wawrzecki replaced the sovereign power in the hands of Stanislaus; the latter retired with the troops and 122 guns, November 7th; and two days after, Suvaroff, after repairing the bridge over the Vistula, which had been burnt, entered Warsaw. He had refused to grant a capitulation, but had promised the inhabitants that their lives and property should be respected. Wawrzecki was pursued by Denisoff and Fersen. Finding his provisions fail, he dismissed his infantry at Opoczno, and with the other generals and his cavalry endeavoured to reach Galicia; but they were attacked at Radoczyn, November 18th, and made prisoners. Most of the leaders of the rebellion were carried into Russia. Such was the end of the Polish insurrection of 1794. In spite of the amnesty promised by Suvaroff, Catharine caused Ignatius Potocki, Mostowski, and other leaders of the insurrection who had remained at Warsaw, to be arrested. The more distinguished patriots were proscribed, their estates were confiscated, and those who had been captured were thrown into dungeons at St. Petersburg, while some thousands of a meaner sort were transported to the deserts of Siberia.

[1] But this number is probably an exaggeration. See Von Sybel, iv. p. 147 note.

Russia, Austria, and Prussia now quietly divided their blood-stained prey, and Poland was blotted out from the map of Europe. It was arranged by the Convention of St. Petersburg, January 3rd, 1795, that besides the Duchy of Courland, a former fief of Poland, Russia should have the Duchy of Semigallia, the district of Pilten, Samogitia, part of the Palatinates of Troki and Chelm, the remainder of those of Vilna, Novogrodek, Brzesc, and Volhynia. To Austria were assigned the town and greater part of the Palatinate of Cracow, the Palatinates of Sandomeirz and Lublin, and part of those of Chelm, Podlachia, and Masovia. The lot of Prussia was the remains of the Palatinates of Rawa and Plotzk, part of Masovia, including Warsaw, which the Prussians had not been able to take, and portions of Podlachia, Troki, and Cracovia. Each of these three shares contained a population of about 1,000,000 souls, some a little more or less. This division was confirmed by a threefold treaty between the Powers, signed at St. Petersburg, October 24th, 1795.[1] Disputes had, however, arisen between Austria and Prussia about the division of Cracovia, the situation of which renders it important as the key both of Galicia and Silesia. The Prussians were in possession of Cracow, and seemed disposed to retain it by force. The point was reserved for future negotiation under the arbitration of the Empress. It was only through her threat to retain Warsaw that the Prussians were brought to evacuate Cracovia. The Austrians entered that province in January, 1796, when the Russians retired from Warsaw, and a Prussian garrison was admitted. The demarcation of Cracovia was finally regulated under Russian mediation, October 21st, 1796.[2]

In October, 1795, King Stanislaus, who had been sent into a kind of banishment at Grodno, was directed to lay down the crown of Poland, which he had worn since 1764. He signed the Act of Abdication, November 25th.[3] A pension of 200,000 ducats was assigned to him. After the accession of Paul I. he took up his residence at St. Petersburg, in which city he died February 12th, 1798. Pierre de Biron, last Duke of Courland, had abdicated in favour of Catharine at St. Petersburg, March 28th, 1795.

Thus was completed one of the most shameful passages in the history of Europe. Poland, however, or rather the great body of the people, could hardly suffer by a change of masters. Nine-tenths of the population consisted of wretched serfs, steeped in the

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 168 sqq. (2nd Ed.)
[2] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 175.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 182.

lowest depths of poverty, ignorance, brutality, and wretchedness. What really fell, as a modern writer observes, was the inhuman rule of a few nobles.[1] Catharine II. did not long outlive these events. She was carried off by apoplexy, November 17th, 1796, in the sixty-seventh year of her age. The policy of her latter years was marked by her hatred of the French Revolution, modified by a paramount regard to her own interest. She renewed the treaty of commerce with England, which expired in 1786, granted the English fresh privileges, and forbade the importation of French merchandise. She also endeavoured to persuade the Ottoman Porte to expel all the French from their dominions, and sent Kutusoff to Constantinople for that purpose, but without success. By a new treaty with England in 1796, she agreed to despatch twelve ships of the line and eight frigates to join the English fleet, on condition of receiving an annual subsidy of one million sterling, besides the expenses of the squadron; but, at the same time, she ordered her Admiral *not to fight*.[2] She was on the point of signing a treaty with England and Austria to supply an army of 60,000 men against the French, but on condition that they should assist her in driving the Turks from Constantinople, when she was surprised by death. She was also implicated at this moment in a war with Persia. Beholding England and the greater part of Europe engaged in a war with France, her restless ambition made her regret having abandoned her projects for the subjugation of Turkey. The anarchy, however, which reigned in Persia since the death of Thamas Kouli Khan, and which was fomented by Russian policy, just as that of Poland had been for its own interested purposes, inspired Catharine with the hope of extending her conquests in that direction. She dreamt of nothing less than conquering Persia, and reviving the magnificent but impracticable and disastrous plan of Peter the Great for diverting the commerce of the East towards Russia, through the Persian Gulf, the Caspian, or the Black Sea. The details of this Asiatic war belong not to our subject. It will suffice to state that an expedition was undertaken early in 1796, under the conduct of Count Valerian Zouboff, one of Catharine's *favourites*. Derband, the capital of Daghestan, was taken. But the army was prevented from penetrating much further by epidemic maladies occasioned by the heats of summer and the immoderate use of fruit; and Paul I., on his accession, recalled his troops from this hopeless enterprise.

[1] Von Sybel. [2] Castéra, *Vie de Catherine* (*Remarque Add.*).

The character of Catharine II. may be gathered from her history. This extraordinary woman, a foreigner, with no legal title to the throne, steeped in the grossest immorality, her hands imbrued in her husband's blood, had governed Russia despotically more than thirty years. This could not have been accomplished without vast administrative talent; but it could have been done only in a country in the condition in which Russia then was. In spite of her sensuality, Catharine had intellectual aspirations, and corresponded with Voltaire. She was fond of children, and her manners were affable and engaging. She had been pretty when young; her countenance was agreeable, and betrayed not the crimes of which she had been guilty, though, as she advanced in life, it assumed a somewhat sinister expression, and the lower part betrayed her sensuality. She was of middling stature, well proportioned, of a graceful and dignified carriage, though at last too corpulent. Her complexion was light, with blue eyes and chestnut hair.

Catharine was succeeded by her son, Paul I. Petrowitsch. At the funeral of the Empress, Paul resolved to make some atonement to his father's ashes. He directed the tomb in the church of St. Alexander Newski, where the body of Peter III. had lain since 1762, to be opened; the coffin to be placed upon a bed of state, next to that of Catharine, having upon it the imperial crown, which had been brought expressly from Moscow; a love-knot united the two coffins, with the following inscription: "Divided in life, united in death." Alexis Orloff and Prince Baratinski were ordered to attend the funeral, and were kept three hours before the eyes of the spectators. Orloff's nerves carried him through the ordeal without his betraying any emotion, but it was with difficulty that Baratinski could be kept from fainting. Orloff received an intimation that he was permitted to travel, and Baratinski was forbidden to appear at Court.[1] It is probable that Paul's conduct in this affair was dictated as much by hatred of his mother as by respect for his father's memory. It was impossible that he should feel any sentiments but those of abhorrence for the unnatural parent who had murdered his father, who had usurped his own crown, who had kept him at a distance, it may be said in disgrace, unprovided with the necessaries of his condition, who had deprived him of the society and government of his children, and whom he saw prostituting herself, to the latest period of her life, to a continual succession

[1] Castéra, liv. xii.

of lovers. It may also be owing to the same cause, that Paul, as we shall have occasion to see, reversed at first much of the policy of his mother, though he, like her, was a determined enemy of the French Revolution.[1] He began his reign by a step which testified his disapprobation of the cruelties exercised in Poland. He restored to liberty more than 14,000 Poles exiled or imprisoned in consequence of the last insurrection. Kosciuszko, Potocki, and many others, were not only liberated, but their estates were also restored to them on their promising to live peaceably.[2] Paul, accompanied by his son Alexander, visited Kosciuszko in his prison, and, being naturally tender hearted, is said to have shed an abundance of tears at the sight of his misery.[3]

Of the Scandinavian kingdoms, Denmark, as we have seen, refused to participate in the great convulsion that was agitating Europe. Christian VII. remained the nominal Sovereign of that country down to his death in 1808, but imbecility of mind rendered him incompetent to govern. The affairs of Denmark were administered by the Prince Royal, Frederick, afterwards Frederick VI., with the assistance of an able Ministry, and especially Count Bernstoff. Under this beneficent government Denmark enjoyed a remarkable prosperity. The liberties of the people were extended, their grievances abolished, learning, science, and education promoted. The French Revolution found, on the other hand, no more zealous and active opponent than Gustavus III. of Sweden. It was this feeling, which they had in common, that united him with Catharine II. The political differences of these sovereigns had assumed a character of personal animosity; but the abhorrence which both felt for the democratic principles of the French converted this feeling into a friendship and union which lasted till the death of Gustavus. The chivalrous but imprudent spirit of Gustavus was flattered with the idea of leading the crusade of the Sovereigns against France. He entered into correspondence with *Monsieur*, the Count d'Artois, the Marquis de Bouillé, and other chiefs of the emigration. In the spring of 1791 he repaired to Aix-la-Chapelle, under pretence of taking the waters, but in reality to consult with the French emigrants; and he was concerned in the preparations for Louis XVI.'s unfortunate flight to Varennes. After the failure of that enterprise, he entertained the extravagant and hazardous scheme

[1] Tooke's *View of the Russian Empire under Catherine II.* and *Life of Catherine II.*; Castéra, *Vie de Catherine II.*; Masson, *Mém. Secrets sur la Russie.*

[2] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 123.

[3] Michelet, *Jusqu'à Waterloo*, p. 54.

of landing Swedish and Russian troops in the Seine, marching upon Paris, and suppressing the Revolution. Gustavus was supported in this anti-revolutionary ardour, which amounted almost to Quixotism, by Catharine II. She proposed to him, through General Pahlen, an intimate alliance, and Gustavus readily accepted a proposal which would enable him to be absent from his dominions without apprehension as to his powerful neighbour. Such seems to have been the chief object of the Treaty of Drottningholm, concluded October 19th, 1791.[1] The treaty is purely a defensive one, in case the dominions of either Power should be attacked; though it is difficult to imagine against what enemies they proposed to defend each other. A marriage had also been agreed upon between the King of Sweden's son Gustavus Adolphus and Catharine's granddaughter, the Grand Duchess Alexandra. But this Russian alliance was highly unpopular in Sweden. The Swedes viewed with disgust the abandonment of the Turks and Poles to a Power which had seized so great a part of the Swedish dominions; they were indignant at Gustavus's distant and chimerical schemes against France, in a cause of which the majority of the nation disapproved, and in which the welfare of the people seemed to be sacrificed to the vanity and ambition of the King. The national feeling was displayed in the Diet which Gustavus summoned at Geffle with the view of raising supplies. But though assembled at that remote place in the Gulf of Bothnia, in order the better to coerce it, and surrounded with the King's mercenary troops, it would grant only part of his demands, and proved so refractory that he was compelled to dismiss it (Feb. 24th, 1792).

An odious conspiracy for assassinating the King had long existed among some of the Swedish nobles. Plots had been organized for effecting this object at Aix-la-Chapelle, Stockholm, and other places, which had hitherto failed; but the dismissal of the States, and the rumoured unconstitutional projects of Gustavus, brought them to maturity. One of the chief promoters of the King's assassination was General Pechlin, an old man of seventy-two. Several other nobles were implicated in the conspiracy, and especially Counts Ribbing and Horn, and Captain Ankarström. These three men took an oath to murder Gustavus, and drew lots to determine who should perpetrate the deed. The lot fell on Ankarström. Besides political enmity, Ankarström had, or conceived he had, personal grounds for hating the King, on the score of an

[1] Martens, t. v. p. 262.

affront received from Gustavus many years previously. After the King's return from Finland, too, in 1788, he had been accused of treason and banished to Gothland, but was shortly after pardoned. These grievances rankled in Ankarström's bosom; and they were aggravated by a considerable loss entailed upon him by the reduction of the currency. Impelled by these feelings, Ankarström in a dastardly manner shot the King in the back at a masquerade given at the Opera House at Stockholm, March 16th, 1792. Gustavus survived till the 29th. During the period which intervened between his wound and his death, he displayed the utmost fortitude and presence of mind, and settled the affairs of his kingdom with all the composure imaginable. His thoughts characteristically reverted to the subject ever uppermost in his mind, the French Revolution; and he expressed a desire to know what Brissot would think of his fate. He was forty-six years of age at the time of his death. The chief conspirators were captured; but Ankarström alone was executed, after three public floggings and other tortures; the rest were either banished from Sweden or confined in fortresses.

Gustavus III.'s son, then in his fourteenth year, succeeded to the Crown of Sweden, with the title of Gustavus Adolphus IV. Till he should attain his majority, the regency was assumed by his uncle Charles, Duke of Sudermania, brother of the late King. The Swedish Court, as we have before had occasion to remark, now adopted a neutral policy; a conduct which produced a misunderstanding with the Court of St. Petersburg. Another cause of dissension was the publication of a proposed marriage of the young King of Sweden with a German princess (October, 1795), in spite of Gustavus's promise that he should be united to the Archduchess Alexandra. Catharine having declared that she should consider the proposed marriage of Gustavus Adolphus as a ground of rupture, it was not prosecuted. Towards the autumn of 1796 Gustavus IV., accompanied by his uncle, paid a visit to the Empress at St. Petersburg. But though the young King was much struck with the charms of the Grand Duchess Alexandra, he refused to sign the marriage contract, on the ground that it contained provisions contrary to the religion which he professed, and to the laws and customs of his country. Catharine was furious at this affront. Her death, however, prevented any ill consequences from ensuing, and on the accession of Paul a good understanding was renewed between the two Courts.[1]

[1] Arndt, *Gesch. Schwedens;* Brown's *Northern Courts.*

The history of the German States at this period is unimportant, except in connection with the French Revolution and the affairs of Poland; and it will therefore suffice to offer a few brief remarks on the effects produced on the German people and their governments by the events that were passing in France.

The same spirit which produced the Revolution in that country had penetrated into Germany and even into its Courts. It had, as we have seen, animated and influenced Frederick the Great and the Emperor Joseph II. The vast intellectual movement observable throughout Europe in the last half of the eighteenth century, the upheaving, as it were, and throes of the European mind, had given birth almost to the first German literature that can be called original and vernacular. The German authors of this period, like the French *literati* themselves, discarded their former classical and French models, and sought in English literature a new source of inspiration. The works of most of their distinguished writers began to breathe a spirit of liberty. Salzmann, in his romance of *Karl von Karlsberg*, placed before the eyes of his numerous readers a striking and perhaps exaggerated picture of the political and social evils under which they laboured. The epic poet Klopstock gave vent to his aspirations for freedom in several Odes. The *Dichterbund*, or band of poets, established at Göttingen about the year 1770, of which Count Stolberg was one of the most distinguished members, looked up to Klopstock as their master. In many of Stolberg's pieces love of liberty and hatred of tyrants are expressed with a boldness which must have grated strangely on the ears of some of the German Sovereigns. But in general these works were in too high a tone to have much influence on the people. Schiller's early tragedies were calculated to have more effect, especially his *Don Carlos*; which, from the speeches of the Marquis de Posa, has been characterized as a dramatized discourse on the rights of man. Yet when the French Revolution broke out, it found no partisan in Schiller. He augured unfavourably of the Constituent Assembly, thought them incompetent to establish, or even to conceive, true liberty; foretold the catastrophe of a military despotism[1]. Goethe, his contemporary, regarded the explosion in France as an unwelcome interruption of the tranquil pleasures of polite and cultivated society; Wieland, in his essays on the French Revolution, took the popular side. A more direct form of propagating liberal principles than by literature was by means of

[1] K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. S. 285.

clubs and secret societies. The clubs of England and France were most formidable political engines; but, then, their debates were public and their objects practical. Such associations would not have been suffered in Germany. The reformers of that country had therefore enlisted themselves in a secret society called the *Order of Illuminati*, founded in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt, a professor of canon law at Ingolstadt, and modelled after the constitution of the Jesuits, whose pupil Weishaupt had been. Its members bound themselves to an unreserved obedience to their superiors, were gradually initiated into the mysteries of the society, and went through the successive ranks of priest, mage, regent, and king. Its principles were characteristic of the German mind, far-fetched and eminently unpractical. The grand doctrine which it professed to disseminate was, that the misfortunes of mankind spring from religion and the dominion of the powerful; that as religion had its source in superstition and priestcraft, so the separation of mankind into peoples and states had been accomplished by fortunate pretenders through force and cunning. But by means of the secret schools of wisdom, man would rise from his fallen state, princes and nations would disappear without violence from the face of the earth, the human race would form one great family, and every father of a household, as in former times Abraham and the patriarchs, become the priest and ruler of his family with no other code of law than that dictated by wisdom. In a few years this society numbered thousands of members, belonging chiefly to the higher classes. Its principles seem not to have threatened any very immediate or alarming danger. Nevertheless it was suppressed by Charles Theodore, Elector of Bavaria; Weishaupt was compelled to fly, and found a refuge at Gotha.[1] In other German States the *Illuminati* appear to have been left unmolested.

Prone to reflection, the German mind is not readily excited to action. Little desire was manifested in Germany to imitate the movement in France. It was only in the Rhenish provinces, where the people came into immediate contact with the French, and could be assisted by their armies, that any revolutionary spirit was manifested. An appeal was even ventured on for patriotic gifts in support of the war of the Empire against French principles, and brought in a few hundred thousand florins. The Austrian Freemasons, whom Joseph II. had patronized, spontaneously suppressed their meetings, in order, as they told the Em-

[1] Menzel, *ibid.* Kap. 15.

peror, to relieve him of some of his cares in that season of disturbance. Nevertheless Thugut, the Austrian Minister, deemed some precaution necessary. Thugut had resided at Paris during the early days of the Revolution, and from an acquaintance with its scenes and personages, had imbibed a deep hatred of popular government, as well as the conviction that if the French Court and clergy had prevented, by means of the police, the philosophers and *beaux esprits* from propagating their principles, the outbreak would never have occurred. Hence he was led to forbid all social unions, and to subject the press to a rigid censorship. Even old and standard works, whose contents were at all of an equivocal character, were prohibited. No allusions were permitted in the theatre to political or religious matters. It was forbidden to represent such plays as *Otto von Wittelsbach, Hamlet, Macbeth, King John, Richard II.* &c., as familiarizing the minds of the spectators with the murder or deposition of kings; *King Lear*, lest it should be thought that misfortune turned the heads of monarchs; still less plays directly provocative of revolutionary ideas, as *Egmont, Fiesco, William Tell.*[1]

The extraordinary career of Thugut deserves to be briefly mentioned. He was born at Linz, the son of a boatman on the Danube, and received his education at the Oriental Academy at Vienna. In 1754 he was sent with the Austrian Embassy to Constantinople, and became consecutively, interpreter, agent, resident, and internuntius. He distinguished himself by his activity during the war between Turkey and Russia, and was subsequently employed as ambassador and negotiator in all congresses and acts of state. He entered the Ministry a little before the death of Prince Kaunitz, who had so long directed the Austrian policy; and to spare the feelings of the aged and declining chancellor, he acted as his subordinate, and apparently under his direction. On the death of the Prince, June 27th, 1794, Thugut obtained the supreme direction of affairs. With an aptitude for business, he united an idleness which sometimes proved detrimental to the public service. The acquisition of Bavaria was regarded by Thugut as the paramount object of Austrian policy, and he had conceived a violent hatred of Prussia for having frustrated that project.

The affairs of Prussia at this period were conducted by Haugwitz, a large landed proprietor of Silesia. In a journey which he

[1] K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. Kap. 27.

made into Italy, Haugwitz acquired the favour of Leopold, then Grand Duke of Tuscany, and after the accession of that Prince to the Imperial throne, and the change produced in Prussian policy by the Convention of Reichenbach, he was sent ambassador to Vienna. He subsequently entered the Cabinet of Berlin as Minister for Foreign Affairs. The fatal estrangement of Prussia from Austria, and from the affairs of the Empire, must be chiefly attributed to his policy. Another notable Prussian statesman of this period, though by birth a Hanoverian, was Baron Hardenberg.

The affairs of Italy will not long detain us, though that country was destined to become before long the scene of events of the greatest moment. In general it may be observed, that although the French Revolution had of course its partisans in Italy, the great mass of the Italian people were not favourable to it. They entertained an ancient aversion to the French from their frequent attempts and well-known desire to establish their dominion in Italy.[1] It has been already related how the French compelled the King of Naples to acknowledge their Republic.[2] Naples was at that time the most considerable of the Italian Powers, and it will be proper to throw a retrospective glance upon its history.[3]

When Charles of Bourbon ascended the throne of Spain in 1759, the Two Sicilies were assigned, as we have already said, to his second son, Ferdinand IV., then nine years of age. The Prince of St. Nicandro, appointed as his governor, was an uneducated man, addicted to the sports of the field, and capable only of instilling into the youthful monarch a love of his own pursuits. Fortunately, however, the Marquis Tanucci, a man of liberal and enlightened principles, possessed great influence in the Neapolitan counsels, and obtained the ear of the King. The main aims of Tanucci were to set bounds to the pretensions of the Pope, and to increase the royal prerogative by reducing the power of the nobles. In no part of Italy were feudal privileges more strictly maintained, or more oppressive, than in the Neapolitan dominions, and especially in the two Calabrias. The barons, like the *ci-devant* nobles of France, enjoyed exclusive rights of hunting and fishing, of grinding corn and baking bread; they named the judges and the governors of cities; besides the customary feudal

[1] Botta, t. i. p. 137. [2] See above, p. 418.

[3] For these affairs see Carlo Botta, *Storia d'Italia dal* 1789 *al* 1814, libro i.; Colletta, *Storia di Napoli.*

services, they claimed the first fruits of the vintage, the harvest, and of all the productions of agriculture and pasturage, as well as of custom, dues, &c. Thus at one and the same time the people were oppressed, the royal authority was almost annihilated, and the treasury deprived of its proper revenues. Tanucci moderated all these abuses, and civilized the manners of the rustic nobles by summoning them to Court. He also introduced many reforms into the relations between Naples and the Court of Rome. By his advice the tribunal of the Papal Nuncio was suppressed, and all appeals to Rome forbidden; the King asserted his right to nominate bishops, abbots, and other prelates; the presentation of a palfrey on St. Peter's day, the badge of feudal subjection to Rome, was converted into an eleemosynary offering; the coronation of the King was left uncelebrated, in order to avoid certain formalities customary since the times of the Norman kings, which indicated the sovereignty of the Holy See. The number of mendicant monks was reduced, and the order of the Jesuits suppressed. These reforms, of course, produced violent quarrels with the Court of Rome; the political disputes between Naples and that Court had caused, indeed, the reform of ecclesiastical abuses to be prosecuted with greater ardour in the Neapolitan dominions than in Tuscany and Austrian Lombardy. Tanucci had also turned his attention to a reform in the laws, which formed an incongruous mixture derived from the Normans, Lombards, Aragonese, French, Spaniards, Austrians, the former conquerors and possessors of the country. But this was a work not so easily accomplished.

Thus Italy remained not uninfluenced by the liberal tendencies which marked the eighteenth century. The authority of the Papal See had been also reduced in the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which were likewise governed by a branch of the Spanish Bourbons. The new opinions had not made so much progress in Ferdinand IV.'s kingdom of Sicily as in his Neapolitan dominions. The feudal system was still vigorous in that island towards the end of the eighteenth century. Sicily had from early times possessed a Parliament composed of three chambers, called *bracci*, or *arms*: namely, the military or baronial chamber, in which sat such *signori*, or lords, as had at least 300 *fuochi*, or dwellings, upon their properties; the ecclesiastical *braccio*, consisting of three archbishops, six bishops, and all the abbots; and the third chamber, called *demaniale*, because it consisted of the representatives of cities belonging to the King's *domain*, and not under

the dominion of the barons. For, as in Germany, there were two sorts of Sicilian cities, the *baronial* and the *free*. The last depended immediately on the King, and were governed by their own municipal laws. The baron of the oldest title was at the head of the *braccio baronale;* the Archbishop of Palermo of the *braccio ecclesiastico*, and the prætor, or mayor, of the same city of the *braccio demaniale*. In ancient times the Parliament met every year, but afterwards once in four years. It also lost its legislative functions, and was assembled only to vote donatives.

Tanucci was not so successful in his foreign as in his domestic policy. He was a partisan of France, and hence he incurred the displeasure of Ferdinand's queen, the Austrian Princess Caroline, a woman of imperious temper, sister of the Emperor Joseph II., and of Marie Antoinette. Tanucci was dismissed, and his place filled at first by the Marquis Sambuca, and then by Acton, the son of an Irish physician. The Neapolitans were indignant at seeing the arms of the French Republic affixed to the hotel of the French Embassy, and in January, 1793, a deputation of the citizens presented an address to King Ferdinand, supplicating him to declare war against France. It was easy to see that the neutrality of Naples could not long be preserved. On the 12th of July, 1793, a treaty was concluded, as we have already said, between Sir W. Hamilton, the English Minister at Naples, and Acton, Ferdinand's chief Minister, by which Ferdinand engaged to unite to the British forces in the Mediterranean 6,000 soldiers, four ships of the line, four frigates, and the same number of smaller vessels, Great Britain undertaking to maintain a respectable fleet in that sea, and to protect Neapolitan commerce.[1] The Neapolitans, as we have seen, subsequently took part in the occupation of Toulon.

The Papal throne was filled, at the time of the French Revolution, by Pius VI. His predecessor, Clement XIV. (Ganganelli), who had risen to the Papacy from the condition of a poor monk, had always retained the simple customs of his early life. These, however, seemed out of place in an age of inquiry, doubt, and disbelief; and it was thought that, when arguments cease to persuade, and virtue to move by its example, the best substitutes for them are pomp, splendour, and magnificence. The Cardinals, therefore, on the death of Clement, in 1774, elected Cardinal Braschi (Pius VI.) as his successor. Braschi was handsome in person, eloquent in speech, refined in his tastes, of dignified

[1] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 480.

manners, and a generous disposition. He had been treasurer to the apostolic *camera*, and had displayed in his demeanour and actions no ordinary splendour. All these good qualities, however, tended to a vicious extreme. He entertained a great opinion of himself as well as of his high dignity; he was arbitrary and disdainful, and could ill brook opposition. A scheme was agitated in his Pontificate, originated by Cardinal Orsini, of uniting all Italy in a confederation, of which the Pope was to be the head. The chief glory of Pius VI. is the draining of the Pontine marshes, a work of extraordinary magnitude and labour.

Pius VI. was naturally shocked and offended by the novelties and innovations in matters of religion which accompanied the breaking out of the French Revolution. The respect with which he was treated by the Constituent Assembly soothed and appeased him for a time, but the excesses and blasphemies of the Legislative Assembly and of the Convention, and especially the loss of Avignon, impelled him to resort to his spiritual weapons. Hence the Emperor and the Italian Princes of his party had little difficulty in persuading Pius to enter into an offensive league against France.

The situation of Tuscany induced the Grand Duke Ferdinand, though so nearly connected with the House of Austria, formally to recognize the French Republic, January 16th, 1793, before the execution of Louis XVI. Tuscany preserved its neutrality till the following October, when the appearance of an English fleet in the Mediterranean encouraged Ferdinand to declare himself for the allies. Of the part taken in the war by Victor Amadeus III., King of Sardinia, we have already spoken. The republic of Genoa, secretly inclined to France, maintained for a considerable time its neutrality, although summoned by the English and Spanish fleet, in October, 1793, to change its policy. The port was now blockaded. Venice had also declared herself neutral. The Venetians, enervated by a long peace, and intent only on their material interests, had sunk into an abyss of moral corruption and degradation. Expecting their safety only from the sufferance of their neighbours and the mutual jealousies of the great Powers, they had lost all public spirit and fallen into a sort of political quietism, which was carried so far that the government actually forbade the representation of tragedies, as calculated to excite and elevate the soul! We are not, therefore, surprised to find

that at the breaking out of the French Revolution they determined on the policy of doing nothing; and they persisted in their neutrality, though solicited by many Powers, Sardinia, Russia, Austria, Naples, to take a part against France. Yet their hatred of that country peeped out on all occasions. They sent back to the French Minister the note of the Assembly acquainting them with the flight of the King to Varennes, because it did not bear Louis's signature; they refused to reply to the notice of the King's acceptance of the Constitution; they suffered the Austrians to violate the neutrality they had declared by marching troops through their territories; in October, 1792, when the allies were entering France, they authorized their subjects to supply the Emperor and the King of Sardinia with arms, provisions, and other necessaries; on the establishment of the French Republic they refused to acknowledge it, and though they at length consented to receive a *chargé d'affaires*, they would only recognize him with a puerile distinction as the Minister of the French *nation* and not of the *republic*.[1] These and other grievances of the same kind, and especially the reception given to the Regent, under the title of Count de Lille, at Verona, towards the end of 1794, drew down upon the Venetian Republic the hatred and vengeance of the French, and served at least as pretexts for its destruction.

Respecting the Spanish Peninsula, little need be added to what has been already said. Although Godoy was despised by every true Spaniard, yet Florida Blanca and d'Aranda had been successively compelled to give place to him; and, in 1792, he obtained, with the title of Duke of Alcudia, the supreme direction of affairs. The war, however, which he commenced with France was at first popular. The Spaniards, devoted to the Church and to their King, beheld in the republicans of France the enemies of both. They contributed largely and spontaneously to the war; the feudal lords, as in ancient times, put themselves at the head of their vassals, the smugglers, and even the monks formed regiments. But the enthusiasm of the nation was ill-directed by Godoy; and the successes of the Spanish arms, already described, were soon followed by reverses which rendered the King anxious to conclude a peace.

The Portuguese had shared with the Spaniards in the French war, and are said to have formed the best portion of the Spanish

[1] See Daru, *Hist. de Venise*, liv. xxxvi.

army. The sceptre of Portugal had been held, since February, 1777, by Queen Maria I., but her intellect having become disordered through religious melancholy, the regency was assumed in 1792 by her son Don John, Prince of Brazil. Don John was governed by his confessors, as other Princes are by their favourites or mistresses; and he is said to have changed them as often.

END OF VOL. IV.

CHISWICK PRESS: CHARLES WHITTINGHAM, TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE.

HISTORICAL WORKS.

MODERN EUROPE. From the Fall of Constantinople to the Establishment of the German Empire, A.D. 1453-1870. By THOMAS HENRY DYER, M.A. Second Edition, revised and continued. In 5 vols. demy 8vo. *2l. 12s. 6d.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, during the Early and Middle Ages. By C. H. PEARSON, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Second Edition, much enlarged. Vol. I. 8vo. *16s.* Vol. II. 8vo. *14s.*

HISTORICAL MAPS of ENGLAND during the first Thirteen Centuries. With Explanatory Essays and Indices. By C. H. PEARSON, M.A. Imp. folio. Second Edition. *31s. 6d.*

THE BARONS' WAR. Including the Battles of Lewes and Evesham. By W. H. BLAAUW, M.A. Second Edition, with Additions and Corrections by C. H. PEARSON, M.A. Demy 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

MARTINEAU'S (HARRIET) HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM 1800-15. Being a Reprint of 'The Introduction to the History of the Peace.' With new and full Index. 1 vol. *3s. 6d.*

MARTINEAU'S (HARRIET) HISTORY OF THE THIRTY YEARS' PEACE, 1815-46. With new and copious Index. 4 vols. *3s. 6d.* each.

These histories contain a vast store of information, only with much labour attainable elsewhere, on all the great social and political questions of the important and interesting period of which they treat—a period separated by so short an interval from our own time that to every educated person who takes an intelligent interest in the questions of the present day a thorough knowledge of its history is indispensable.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND, from the Norman Conquest to the Reign of Queen Anne. By AGNES STRICKLAND. Library Edition. With Portraits, Autographs, and Vignettes. 8 vols. post 8vo. *7s. 6d.* each. Also a Cheaper Edition in 6 vols. *5s.* each.

LIVES OF THE LAST FOUR PRINCESSES OF THE ROYAL HOUSE OF STUART. Forming an appropriate Sequel to the 'Lives of the Queens of England.' With a Photograph of the Princess Mary, after a picture by Honthorst. Crown 8vo. *12s.*

THE LIFE OF MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS. By AGNES STRICKLAND. 2 vols. post 8vo. *5s.* each.

HUME, SMOLLETT, & HUGHES' HISTORY OF ENGLAND. 18 vols. [sold separately] post 8vo. *4s.* each.

THE STORY OF THE IRISH BEFORE THE CONQUEST. From the Mythical Period to the Invasion under Strongbow. By LADY FERGUSON. Fcap. 8vo. *5s.*

HISTORY OF THE IRISH REBELLION IN 1798. By W. H. MAXWELL. With Portraits and Etchings on Steel by George Cruikshank. Tenth Edition. *7s. 6d.*

THIERRY'S HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF ENGLAND BY THE NORMANS; its Causes, and its Consequences in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Continent. Translated from the 7th Paris edition by WILLIAM HAZLITT. With short Memoir of Thierry, Index, and Portraits of Thierry and William the Conqueror. 2 vols. *3s. 6d.* each.

JESSE'S MEMOIRS OF THE PRETENDERS AND THEIR ADHERENTS. With Index and Portraits. Post 8vo. *5s.*

JESSE'S MEMOIRS OF THE COURT OF ENGLAND DURING THE REIGN OF THE STUARTS, including the Protectorate. 3 vols. With Index and 42 Portraits. *5s.* each.

NUGENT'S (LORD) MEMORIALS OF HAMPDEN, HIS PARTY AND TIMES. With a Memoir of the Author, copious Index, an Autograph Letter, and Portraits. Post 8vo. *5s.*

CARREL'S HISTORY OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND for the Re-establishment of Popery under Charles II. and James II. By ARMAND CARREL. Together with Fox's (Right Hon. C. J.) History of the Reign of James II., and Lord Lonsdale's Memoir of the Reign of James II. With Portrait of Carrel after Viardot. *3s. 6d.*

JAMES'S (G. P. R.) HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF RICHARD CŒUR DE LION, King of England. With Index and Portraits of Richard and Philip Augustus. 2 vols. *3s. 6d.* each.

COXE'S MEMOIRS OF THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH. With his original Correspondence, collected from the family records at Blenheim. Edited by Archdeacon W. COXE, M.A., F.R.S. Revised Edition by JOHN WADE. With Portraits and Index. 3 vols. post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

*** An Atlas of the plans of Marlborough's campaigns, 4to. 10*s.* 6*d.*

COXE'S HISTORY of the HOUSE OF AUSTRIA. From the Foundation of the Monarchy by Rhodolph of Hapsburgh to the Death of Leopold II., 1218-1792. By Archdeacon COXE. Together with a Continuation from the Accession of Francis I. to the Revolution of 1848. To which is added Genesis, or Details of the late Austrian Revolution (translated from the German). With Portraits of Maximilian, Rhodolph, Maria Theresa, and Francis Joseph. 4 vols. with Indexes, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

LIFE OF THE EMPEROR KARL THE GREAT [Charlemagne]. Translated from the Contemporary History of Eginhard, with Notes and Chapters on Eginhard, the Franks, Karl, and the Breaking-up of the Empire. With a Map. By WILLIAM GLAISTER, M.A., B.C.L., University College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

GERMANY, MENZEL'S HISTORY OF, from the Earliest Period to a recent date. With Index and Portraits of Charlemagne, Charles V., and Metternich. 3 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

RUSSIA, HISTORY OF, from the Earliest Period. Compiled from the most authentic sources, including Karamsin, Tooke, and Ségur. By WALTER K. KELLY. With Index and Portraits of Catherine, Nicholas, and Menschikoff. 2 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

OCKLEY'S HISTORY OF THE SARACENS and THEIR CONQUESTS IN SYRIA, PERSIA, AND EGYPT. Comprising the Lives of Mohammed and his Successors to the Death of Abdalmelik, the Eleventh Caliph. By SIMON OCKLEY, B.D., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Sixth Edition. With Portrait of Mohammed. 3*s.* 6*d.*

CONDÉ'S HISTORY OF THE DOMINION of THE ARABS IN SPAIN. Translated from the Spanish by Mrs. FOSTER. With Engraving of Abderahmen Ben Moavia, and Index. 3 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

MACHIAVELLI'S HISTORY OF FLORENCE and of the Affairs of Italy, from the Earliest Times to the Death of Lorenzo the Magnificent; together with the Prince, Savonarola, various Historical Tracts, and a Memoir of Machiavelli. With Index and Portrait. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HUNGARY, its History and Revolution: together with a copious Memoir of Kossuth from authentic sources. With Index and Portrait of Kossuth. 3*s.* 6*d.*

ROSCOE'S (W.) LIFE of LORENZO DE MEDICI, called 'the Magnificent,' including the Copyright Notes and Illustrations, and Index. With his Poems, Letters, &c. Tenth Edition revised, with Memoir of Roscoe by his Son, and Portrait of Lorenzo (after Vasari). 3*s.* 6*d.*

ROSCOE'S (W.) LIFE and PONTIFICATE OF LEO X., with the Copyright Notes, Appendices of Historical Documents, the Dissertation on Lucretia Borgia. Final Edition, revised by THOMAS ROSCOE, with Index, and two Portraits of Roscoe, and one of Leo X. 2 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

RANKE'S HISTORY OF THE POPES, their Church and State, and especially of their Conflicts with Protestantism in the 16th and 17th Centuries. Translated by E. FOSTER. With Portraits of Julius II., Innocent X., and Clement VII. 3 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

RANKE'S HISTORY OF SERVIA AND THE SERVIAN REVOLUTION. With an Account of the Insurrection in Bosnia. Translated by Mrs. KERR. To which is added, The Slave Provinces of Turkey, from the French of Cyprien Robert and other sources. 1 vol. 3*s.* 6*d.*

KINGS OF ROME, History of the. By T. H. DYER, LL.D. With a Prefatory Dissertation on the Sources and Evidences of Early Roman History. Demy 8vo. 16*s.*

DECLINE OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC. From the Destruction of Carthage to the Consulship of Julius Cæsar. By GEORGE LONG, M.A. 5 vols. 8vo. 14*s.* per vol.

'If any one can guide us through the almost inextricable mazes of this labyrinth, it is Mr. Long.'—*Saturday Review.*

MASON (A. J.). THE PERSECUTION OF DIOCLETIAN; an Historical Essay. By ARTHUR JAMES MASON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

'This is one of the most striking and original contributions to ecclesiastical history which has come under our notice for some time.'—*Spectator.*

'Mr. Mason has worked vigorously and independently, and in a right direction. We do not pretend to be convinced by him on all points, but he has given us, at least, a good deal of matter for thought.'—*Saturday Review.*

GIBBON'S ROMAN EMPIRE, Complete and Unabridged, with Variorum Notes, including, in addition to the Author's own, those of Guizot, Wenck, Niebuhr, Hugo, Neander, and other Scholars. Edited by an English Churchman. 7 vols. With copious Index, and two Maps and a Portrait of Gibbon. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN EUROPE. Translated by A. R. SCOBLE. With Index. 3*s.* 6*d.*

GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION OF 1640. From the Accession of Charles I. to his Death. With a Preliminary Essay on its Causes and Success. Translated by WILLIAM HAZLITT. With Portrait of Charles, after Vandyke. With Index. 3*s.* 6*d.*

GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF CIVILISATION, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated by WILLIAM HAZLITT. With Portraits of Guizot, Charlemagne, and Louis IX. 3 vols. with Index, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

JAMES (G. P. R.), THE LIFE and TIME OF LOUIS XIV. With Index, and Portraits of Louis XIV. and Mazarin. 2 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

DE LOLME ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND; or an Account of the English Government, in which it is compared both with the Republican form of Government and the other Monarchies of Europe. Edited, with Life of the Author and Notes, by JOHN MACGREGOR, M.P. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LAMARTINE'S HISTORY of THE GIRONDISTS; or, Personal Memoirs of the Patriots of the French Revolution, from unpublished sources. Translated by H. T. RYDE. With Index, and Portraits of Robespierre, Madame Roland, and Charlotte Corday. 3 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

LAMARTINE'S HISTORY of THE RESTORATION of MONARCHY in FRANCE (a Sequel to his History of the Girondists). With Index, and Portraits of Lamartine, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Ney, and Louis XVII. 4 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

LAMARTINE'S HISTORY of THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1848. With Index and Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*

MICHELET'S HISTORY of THE ROMAN REPUBLIC. Translated by W. HAZLITT. With Appendix, Index, and a Portrait of Michelet. 3*s.* 6*d.*

MICHELET'S HISTORY of THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, from its earliest indications to the flight of the King in 1791. With Index and Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*

MIGNET'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, from 1789-1814. With Index and Portrait of Napoleon. 3*s.* 6*d.*

PHILIP DE COMMINES, MEMOIRS OF. Containing the Histories of Louis XI. and Charles VIII., Kings of France, and Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. Together with the Scandalous Chronicle, or Secret History of Louis XI., by JEAN DE TROYES. Edited, with a Life of De Commines and Notes, by Andrew R. SCOBLE. With Index, and Portraits of Charles the Bold and Louis XI. 2 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

SULLY, MEMOIRS OF THE DUKE OF, Prime Minister to Henry the Great. Translated from the French, with Notes, an Historical Introduction, Index, and Portraits of Sully, Henry IV., Coligny, and Marie de Medicis. 4 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

SCHLEGEL'S (F.) LECTURES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE and THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE. Translated by A. J. W. MORRISON. With Index. 3*s.* 6*d.*

SCHLEGEL'S (F.) LECTURES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. Translated from the German, with a Memoir of the Author, by J. B. ROBERTSON. With Index and Portrait. 3*s.* 6*d.*

SCHLEGEL'S (F.) LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY, together with the Lectures entitled Cæsar and Alexander, and The Beginning of Our History. Translated by L. PURCELL and R. H. WHITELOCK. With Index. 3*s.* 6*d.*

TYTLER'S (PROF.) THE ELEMENTS OF GENERAL HISTORY. New Edition. Revised and brought down to Christmas, 1874. Small post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE STUDENT'S TEXT-BOOK OF ENGLISH AND GENERAL HISTORY, from B.C. 100 to the Present Time, with Genealogical and Literary Tables, and Sketch of the English Constitution. By D. BEALE. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE STUDENT'S CHRONOLOGICAL MAPS OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY. By D. BEALE. Medium 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

A PRACTICAL SYNOPSIS OF ENGLISH HISTORY; or, A General Summary of Dates and Events for the use of Schools, Families, and Candidates for Public Examinations. By Arthur Bowes. 4th edition. Demy 8vo. 2*s.*

[TURN OVER

ENGLISH CHRONICLES.

Post 8vo. 5s. per Volume.

BEDE'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. With Notes, Analysis, Index, and Map. By Dr. GILES.

CHRONICLES OF THE CRUSADERS. Richard of Devizes, Geoffrey de Vinsauf, Lord de Joinville.

FLORENCE OF WORCESTER'S CHRONICLE, with the Two Continuations: comprising Annals of English History to the Reign of Edward I.

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS' HISTORICAL WORKS: Topography of Ireland; History of the Conquest of Ireland; Itinerary through Wales; and Description of Wales. With Index. Edited by THOMAS WRIGHT.

HENRY OF HUNTINGDON'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH, from the Roman Invasion to Henry II.; with the Acts of King Stephen, &c.

INGULPH'S CHRONICLE of the ABBEY OF CROYLAND, with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and other Writers. By H. T. RILEY.

MATTHEW PARIS'S CHRONICLE. In 5 vols. FIRST SECTION: Roger of Wendover's Flowers of English History, from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235. Translated by Dr. GILES. 2 vols. SECOND SECTION: From 1235-1273. With Index to the entire Work. 3 vols.

MATTHEW of WESTMINSTER'S FLOWERS OF HISTORY, especially such as relate to the affairs of Britain, to A.D. 1307. Translated by C. D. YONGE. In 2 vols.

ORDERICUS VITALIS' ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND NORMANDY. With Chronicle of St. Evroult. Translated, with Notes, by T. FORESTER, M.A. In 4 vols.

ROGER DE HOVEDEN'S ANNALS OF ENGLISH HISTORY; from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201. Edited by H. T. RILEY. In 2 vols.

ROGER OF WENDOVER. *See Matthew Paris.*

SIX OLD ENGLISH CHRONICLES, viz.:—Asser's Life of Alfred, and the Chronicles of Ethelwerd, Gildas, Nennius, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and Richard of Cirencester.

WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, CHRONICLE OF THE KINGS OF ENGLAND. Translated by SHARPE.

PAULI'S (Dr. R.) LIFE of ALFRED THE GREAT. Translated from the German. To which is appended Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Version of Crosius, with a literal Translation, and an Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Glossary.

COOPER'S BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY. Containing concise Notices (upwards of 15,000) of Eminent Persons of all Ages and Countries, and more particularly of distinguished Natives of Great Britain and Ireland. By THOMPSON COOPER, F.R.S., Editor of 'Men of the Time,' and Joint Editor of 'Athenæ Cantabrigienses.' 1 vol. 8vo. 12*s.*

'It is an important original contribution to the literature of its class by a painstaking scholar . . . . It seems in every way admirable, and fully to justify the claims on its behalf put forth by its editor.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'The mass of information which it contains, especially as regards a number of authors, more or less obscure, is simply astonishing.'—*Spectator.*

'Comprises in 1210 pages, printed very closely in double columns, an enormous amount of information.'—*Examiner.*

THE ONLY AUTHORIZED AND UNABRIDGED EDITION.

WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Including Scientific, Technical, and Biblical Words and Terms, with their Significations, Pronunciations, Alternative Spellings, Derivations, Synonyms, and numerous Illustrative Quotations. With a Supplement containing over 4600 new Words and Meanings. In 1 volume of 1628 pages, with 3000 Illustrations. 4to. cloth, 21*s.*

THE COMPLETE DICTIONARY contains, in addition to the above matter, several valuable Literary Appendices, and 70 extra pages of Illustrations, grouped and classified, and a New Biographical Dictionary of upwards of 9700 names. 1919 pages. In cloth, 31*s.* 6*d.*

'Certainly the best practical English Dictionary extant.'—*Quarterly Review, Oct.* 1873.

Prospectuses, with Specimen Pages, sent post free on application.

LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

BINDING LIST FEB 1

D
208
D85
1877
v.4

Dyer, Thomas Henry
Modern Europe
2d ed., rev. and continued

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY